

The  
American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION AT CHICAGO

FOR some years the successive meetings of the American Historical Association have vied one with the other in interest and usefulness. In describing these meetings it is no longer possible to use descriptive adjectives in the comparative or superlative degree. All of them have been practically above criticism or complaint. The recent meeting at Chicago—December 28 to 30, 1904—was no less satisfactory in all respects than its predecessors, and candor forbids us to use more laudatory phrases. The programme was excellent, the social arrangements were admirable, the courtesy of those in charge of the meeting and the attentions of friends of the Association in Chicago unfailing and unremitting.

Most of the sessions were held at the University of Chicago, in the Reynolds Club House and in the Leon Mandel Assembly Hall adjoining, which were well adapted to the purposes and gave facilities not only for the stated programme but for committee and board meetings, and for social intercourse, which after all is the most important feature of these gatherings. The American Economic Association and the American Political Science Association held meetings at the same time and place, and there were three joint sessions; at the first the chief paper was the address of the president of the Political Science Association; at the second, the addresses of the presidents of the Economic Association and the Historical Association were read; at the third, topics in industrial history were discussed by the economists and the historians. The attendance was large and representative, more numbers being registered and probably many more present than at any previous meeting. As was the case at New Orleans, nearly all sections of the country were well represented. Though not so many came from the Pacific coast or the south

Atlantic states as were in attendance a year ago, New England and the middle states were largely represented, as were nearly all of the states of the Mississippi basin.

At the end of the first session a luncheon was served to visiting delegates in Hutchinson Hall, the university commons—a charming reproduction of the hall of Christ Church College, Oxford. The same afternoon the ladies were invited to a tea by Mrs. William Gardner Hale. Wednesday evening a reception was given by the Chicago Historical Society at their building, and the next afternoon the delegates were received by President and Mrs. Harper. An enjoyable smoker was held at the Hotel del Prado on Thursday evening. The same evening the ladies were entertained at the residence of Professor James Westfall Thompson, by Mrs. Thompson and Mrs. Mary J. Wilmarth. The Quadrangle Club, the Union League Club, the City Club, and the University Club gave non-resident members the free use of their club-rooms, and the same courtesy was shown the ladies of the Association by the Chicago Women's Club. The success of the meeting was in no small measure due to the tireless work and good judgment of Professor J. Franklin Jameson, chairman of the committee on programme, and of Mr. Charles L. Hutchinson, chairman of the committee on arrangements.

The meetings once more gave evidence of the wide interests of American historical scholars, of the spirit of coöperation, and of the best of scholastic good-fellowship. One of the meetings was given up to conferences or "round-tables" on special subjects, a feature of the programme which proved peculiarly attractive, as is likely to be the case where topics of live interest are discussed and where practical methods are considered. The practice of dividing the Association into sections, which years ago was followed for a time, had its evident disadvantages, since it destroyed the unity of the meetings and simply added to the number of formal papers to which one might listen if he chose; but such a plan as that adopted at Chicago, of giving one session to a number of special gatherings in which matters of interest may be freely discussed by a comparatively small number of men, is of very evident effect in increasing the interest and the value of the meetings. One would hesitate to say that the plan should always be followed in the future, but this at least is certain, that the morning session given up to the round-table conferences was the most profitable and interesting of all. The meeting as a whole was of unquestioned service to western scholars, and perhaps of special value because it brought together an unusual number of workers in local history and gave them new courage and interest.

At the first session, held in Leon Mandel Assembly Hall, an address of welcome was given by President William R. Harper, after which Professor Frank J. Goodnow, of Columbia University, president of the American Political Science Association, gave the first annual address, choosing for his topic the work of the new association. He dwelt chiefly on topics and fields of study that need attention from investigators in political science and on the desirability of coöperation between practical workers and theorists which the association might promote, and emphasized the desirability of a thorough and scientific examination of principles and practices of administration.

After these addresses had been delivered before the three societies, two papers were read in a joint meeting of the Historical and Political Science Associations. Professor William M. Sloane, of Columbia University, in a paper entitled "The Contrast of Political Theory and Practice in France under the Convention", examined critically the French government under the Convention from 1793 to 1795. He declared that an assembly chosen to make a constitution usurped the sovereign power without excuse, and that the plea of necessity was invalid. The coalition against France was not formidable, because it had no solid basis and no consistency. The internal affairs of France gave the Jacobins no monopoly in saving the country, for there was already a constituted executive, and the boundless resources of the country were just as available for the republicans as a whole as they were for one faction of the party. The Convention was not merely a usurper, it was irregular and illegitimate in both its membership and its organization. Surrendering its power to two committees, the Executive Council and that of Public Security, it devoted itself solely to party ends. Its earliest effort in arrogating sovereignty to an oligarchy by the Committee of General Defense was a failure. Thereupon it deliberately sacrificed for its own ends the entire Girondin party and created the Committee of Public Safety, which took advantage of the public disorders to create a Jacobin autocracy. The most efficient organ of this shameless tyranny—the Revolutionary tribunal—steadily declined into a factional committee of assassination. Any effort to judge the "Terror" even as a means justified by the end is foredoomed to failure; for France has been saved several times in moments quite as critical: but it was done by sane men, and the success did not deliver her bound to governments like the disreputable Directory and an eventual military despotism.

Mr. Jesse S. Reeves read a paper on the Napoleonic Confederacy in the United States, an organization by the French refugees in

America having for its purpose the placing of Joseph Bonaparte upon the throne of Mexico. In the summer of 1817 G. Hyde de Neuville, the French minister at Washington, obtained possession of certain letters sent by Joseph Lakanal to Joseph Bonaparte. These letters disclosed a conspiracy among French refugees in America, but, though the attention of the State Department was called to the matter, no steps were taken to apprehend the leaders. In the spring of 1818, a company of two hundred men, under General Lallemand, left Philadelphia, landed at Galveston, and proceeded up the Trinity river. A settlement called Champ d'Asile was founded, but its existence was short; menaced by the Spanish, and suffering for want of food, the wretched Napoleonic soldiers abandoned their settlement and returned to Galveston, where they were found by General Graham, who had been sent by Monroe to investigate the purposes of the expedition. Inasmuch as Lallemand's plans came to naught and there was no proof that Joseph Bonaparte had any part in the undertaking, the government of the United States did not think it best to take further notice of the purposes and plans of the conspirators. Mr. Reeves's narrative was based on the correspondence on file in the Department of State.

The afternoon of Wednesday was given to a meeting of the Council, and of various committees and boards which now have in charge many of the important functions of the Association. In the evening a joint meeting of the Historical and Economic Associations was held in the Chicago Historical Society building. Mr. Franklin H. Head, in behalf of the Chicago Historical Society, welcomed the associations in a felicitous address. President Frank W. Taussig, of the Economic Association, discussed the present position of the doctrine of free trade. After considering the general arguments for free trade and protection, he said that conclusions as to the general argument for protection for young industries have an uncertain ring; and that while protection cannot be proved to be useless, certain economic phenomena in this country show that it is not indispensable. The essence of the doctrine of free trade is that international trade brings a gain, and, in consequence, all restrictions upon it a loss. Departures from this principle may perhaps be justified, but they need to prove their own case, and if made in view of the pressure of opposing interests, such departures are a matter of regret. The address of the president of the Historical Association, Professor Goldwin Smith, which in his absence was read by Professor Benjamin S. Terry, appears in this number of the REVIEW, and in consequence it is not necessary to speak of its scope or character.

The session of Thursday morning, when the round-table con-



ferences were held, was of peculiar interest; and the fact that many felt, when the conferences were finished, that much remained to be said is ample proof of the profitableness and utility of the discussions. The officers of the Association have long felt that an effort should be made to bring the state historical societies into closer relations with one another and with the general association, in order that, by means of greater coöperation, objects of common interest might be attained, and unwise and unnecessary duplication of work avoided. With the hope of establishing this closer relationship, a conference of representatives from state and local societies was made part of the Chicago programme, and its success was marked. The sessions were held in the library of the Reynolds Club House. Dr. Reuben G. Thwaites, who acted as chairman, in opening the meeting stated in a few well-chosen words the purposes in view and what might be gained for mutual benefit by a better understanding among local societies. In a paper on the forms of organization and the relation to the state governments Mr. Thomas M. Owen, director of the Alabama Department of Archives and History, spoke of the obligation resting upon the state for the preservation and care of its archives, and of the desirability of having an officer specially charged with this duty. This work should be consigned to some one who is interested in historical matters and appreciates the value of documentary material, inasmuch as the average administrative officer is not likely to have much respect for documents that have no immediate and evident utility. The state historical society is unable to care for the public records, and only by the establishment of a distinct department can suitable appropriations commonly be expected. The speaker described the organization existing in Alabama, where there is a separate department of the government, under the general management of a board of trustees, and a director is appointed as a state trustee; the State Historical Society of Alabama has decided to surrender to the state the task of collecting manuscripts, and to content itself with holding meetings, publishing material, and stimulating interest in history. Mr. Warren Upham, secretary of the Minnesota Historical Society, spoke in approval of the methods existing in those states where the expenses of the historical society are met by legislative appropriations. Without denying the value of such an organization as that of Alabama, and without underestimating the immense work done by such associations as the Massachusetts Historical Society, he pointed out the evident advantages of such a system as that of Wisconsin and of some of the other states in the northwest. A state department of history is in danger of being subjected to political influence. A historical society, aided

by the state in an evident public duty, can collect and care for historical documents and also arouse popular interest as a public officer cannot. Mr. C. M. Burton, of Detroit, president of the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society, and well known as a devoted collector of historical materials, spoke earnestly of the need of coöperation to the end that unnecessary duplication of work might be avoided and more thorough work accomplished. He advocated the preparation of a general index to the publications of historical societies, a task which would be easily performed if the historical societies of the country would be willing to work together. Professor B. F. Shambaugh, of the University of Iowa, spoke briefly of the proper division of the field between the state society and the local societies within the same state, and pointed out the value of local societies in preserving documents and in aiding the state society in the task of collection.

Professor F. L. Riley, of the University of Mississippi, commenting on the general subject under discussion, spoke favorably of the arrangement in Mississippi, where there is an active historical society and also a well-organized state department, the former at the university, the latter at the state capital. Professor A. C. McLaughlin, at the suggestion of the chairman, gave a short statement of the proposed work of the Bureau of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution. Referring to the work already done in England by Professor C. M. Andrews, he said that it is the intention to make a thorough report on the British archives and, in the coming year, to begin the examination of the Spanish archives, with the hope of being of service not only to investigators, but to historical societies that wish to have transcripts made. It is also the intention of the bureau to gather information concerning all manuscript collections of historical societies, in order that there may be in one place knowledge of the materials that are scattered throughout the country.

The round-table conference on the teaching of church history had a fair attendance, and the proceedings were of great interest to all present. Professor F. A. Christie, of the Meadville Theological School, presiding, opened the conference by a plea for a consideration of the problems of church history as problems of historical science without the control of dogmatic or ecclesiastical interests. Regret was expressed that the body of workers in this field does not compare favorably in numbers or energy with those who contribute to other divisions of the field of history, and that the production of results is equally disappointing. Having indicated certain problems of the definition and treatment of the subject, the speaker held that a higher scientific activity calls for ampler material equipment in theological

schools and for the introduction of the study in institutions other than theological. When colleges afford an outline of knowledge, the instruction in theological schools can use more intensive methods and yield higher results.

Professor Albert T. Swing, of Oberlin, speaking on methods of teaching, made a vigorous argument for a system that would occupy the student with the problems of exposition and reproduction. In view of the future vocation of the student, an extensive thesis was held to be less desirable than the preparation of addresses in such literary form as would make a living appeal to a mass of hearers. The aim should be twofold: the discovery and analysis of vital movements by the exercise of true historical insight; and the immediate presentation of these ideas with a judicial temper and a sensitive skill of artistic expression. After indicating the divisions and methods of the general survey of church history, Professor Swing urged the historical analysis of the origin and development of doctrines as the crowning work of the department.

Dealing with the problem of the fostering of independent research, Professor Shailer Mathews, of the University of Chicago, held that a theological school aims at practical efficiency in a profession, and that the general body of its students should not be expected to accomplish special research. The seminary must first teach the body of things and then in the senior year give some discipline in the use of sources, not for the production of technical historians, but to show the difference of opinion and fact and to teach the method of construction. On the other hand, students preparing to teach must be given a separate technical training, and the instructor must pursue research for his own good. Professor Mathews advocated the systematic editing and publication of documents of American church history by instructors, with the collaboration of advanced students, and a project of coöperative historical writing after the model of the *Cambridge Modern History*.

On the theme of church history in colleges and graduate schools, Professor Carl Russell Fish, of the University of Wisconsin, made a stimulating and suggestive speech with special regard to American history. Although churches have had a great influence on the growth of our civilization, the attention given to them in general courses is slight and confined to the bizarre and the picturesque. Vital problems are seldom handled. As the multiplication of college courses forbids the average student to take a special course in church history, it is necessary to correlate the subject with general history. The advantage of this is seen in the broadening and consequent simplification of the whole view of history. An illustration is the

growth and the history of united organizations in the churches and the political union of the country. If college teachers are to have the basis for such correlation, it must be furnished by the specialists in church history and by those who have made a comparative study of the several churches, as well as of religious and civil institutions. This is the most profitable field for the graduate student, who will find whole series of problems by simply placing side by side the ascertained facts in these several subjects and observing the relationships and the discrepancies which there appear.

The conference on the teaching of history in the elementary school was likewise interesting and profitable. Professor J. A. James, of Northwestern University, who acted as chairman, opened the meeting with a few words concerning the importance of the problems that were to come up for discussion. He showed that there is at the present time no agreement in practice or in theory; there are few indications of any tendency to uniformity in the schools. Occasionally men competent to speak with wisdom have been called to plan a course of study for the grades, but expert recommendations have in the past been of little use. The time, however, may now have come for a thorough and, if possible, authoritative study of the whole situation. Professor H. W. Thurston, of the Chicago Normal School, read a paper on "Some Suggestions for an Elementary Course of Study in History." The aim of history teaching is to help the child to understand in a true sense what his American fellows are now doing and to help him to intelligent voluntary action in agreement or disagreement with them; a course of study with this general aim would begin with the child's problems in his social environment and carry on from grade to grade the examination of such contemporary social problems as are within the child's comprehension. This study would embrace likewise attention in every grade to genetic problems in the past. The events studied should be in the industrial, political, social, and religious fields, and be chosen primarily from direct physical and psychical ancestry of Americans. Different "unit topics" should not, the speaker said, be presented in chronological order, but rather in such a way that there will be the strongest tendency in the child to relate the past to himself, that he may feel that the ways and thoughts of the present are the product of development and evolution.

In continuing the discussion, Dr. George O. Virtue, of the Winona State Normal School, Minnesota, said he did not think that in choosing material for preparatory work stress should be laid on the interest of the child; the safer guide is the child's future needs. A proper course would not be very different from that now followed

in many American schools. It gives a prominent place in the seventh and eighth years to American history, which might well be preceded by ancient and English history. The momentary interests of such a course might be made to conform roughly to the demands of those holding to the culture-epoch theory and be fitted to the needs of children of varying experience and abilities; it is rich in possibilities for developing the imagination, rousing the enthusiasm, and building standards of personal and civic conduct. The mental training from the study of history, which some persons assert to be only a by-product of history study in the lower schools, could be made really valuable and significant if proper attention were paid to conditions of preparation, to the time employed, and to securing skilled instruction. Miss Emily J. Rice, of the School of Education, University of Chicago, spoke briefly on the preparation of the elementary teacher. She emphasized the fact that new ideals in education are making new demands on the teacher; her task is not to compel her pupils to commit a few pages or to memorize a few meaningless details; she must help to bring the subject-matter of history home to the child and to relate it to his experience. Stress should be laid on industrial history and the development of the arts. The test of a teacher's success is to be found in the habits of study which her pupils acquire under her guidance and inspiration.

Following these papers was a general discussion in which a number of persons participated, among them Professor A. H. Sanford, of the Stevens Point Normal School, Wisconsin, who declared that general principles should be laid down and superintendents left to work out the details in a way suited to their own needs; Professor J. S. Young, of the Mankato Normal School, Minnesota, who said that history study should begin with the first grade and develop by regular stages; Professor J. B. McMaster, of the University of Pennsylvania, who believed that in the process of Americanizing the foreigners we must fill their minds with facts of American history, which they may not understand, but which they must take as so much medicine; and Professor James Sullivan, who said that we now have an undue proportion of American history. Some of the speakers radically disagreed with Professor McMaster, declaring that a mere accumulation of facts is of little moment. There seemed to be general agreement as to the wisdom of a wide and substantial course in American history, as the best preparation for civic duties and for the comprehension of the meaning of American society, in which the boys and girls of the school are called upon to pass their lives. One would judge from the course of the discussion that there should be no serious difficulty in marking out a course of

study for the grades, if the task is entered upon seriously and intelligently. That the subject might secure the requisite attention, the conference asked the Council to appoint a committee similar to the Committee of Seven, which should recommend a history course for the elementary schools.

At the conference which considered the doctoral dissertation in history and the doctor's degree there was a large attendance. The room where the session was held was too small to contain all who sought admission, and the discussions were of unusual interest. There was a general feeling that the problems under consideration are vital and important. In opening the discussion, the presiding officer, Professor George B. Adams,<sup>1</sup> of Yale, said that in following German practice in this country we had, in his opinion, followed the wrong road; by granting the degree freely to every one completing a required course, and by demanding as a dissertation a piece of original work, we are likely in the end to magnify the importance of little things and run the risk of creating the impression that what is only the beginning is the real end; we shall fall also into a state in which process seems the only thing, without regard to the value of the result. For the first of these conditions the thesis is largely responsible; for the student—and sometimes the instructor—labors under the impression that the product of the student's minute toil is really an important contribution to knowledge, whereas in the majority of cases, certainly in medieval history, these laborious theses merely cumber the shelves and are but impediments in the way of the really creative scholar. Professor Adams called attention to the number of men who do nothing after compiling their dissertations, and fall back with an undeserved and unnecessary feeling of failure into the work of the secondary schools. As a remedy, he advised the establishment of two doctorates, the first of which should stand for about the amount and kind of training now required for the doctorate. For this degree the thesis need not be an original contribution to knowledge, and there should be no requirement that it be printed; the more advanced should be similar to the French degree, obtainable only by mature scholars after a searching examination and on the presentation of a dissertation indicative of real scholarship and creative ability. If it were possible, he said, to advance our present master's degree to about our present doctor's degree, and the doctor's to the point of the French doctorate, the arrangement would be altogether desirable. By agreeing on an advanced degree, American universities would gain the advantages of both

<sup>1</sup> Professor Adams's paper introducing this discussion, rewritten and enlarged, will appear in an early number of the *Educational Review*.

German and French practices; they would not lose their influence on the secondary schools; we should avoid conveying to the student a wrong impression of his own attainments and prospects, and should escape a barren and desolating flood of printed dissertations of no substantial value, which threatens to be a burden to every branch of knowledge.

Professor D. C. Munro, of the University of Wisconsin, spoke of the various kinds of students who seek the doctorate; the training given those who are to be writers of history should be different from that offered those who are seeking only a broad scholarship and a fuller knowledge than can be acquired in the undergraduate course. If the former class is to be properly prepared, training in the technique of history requires so much time that no thesis fairly worth printing can as a rule be written. In this respect history stands, perhaps, on a different plane from that of the physical sciences, where it is not impossible for the comparatively immature student to make a serious contribution to his science. Professor Munro could not agree with Professor Adams as to the usefulness of the proposed second doctorate. Professor James Harvey Robinson, of Columbia, said that the doctor's degree might be taken too seriously; certainly for some purposes the master's degree is more useful. There are great differences, he said, in the capacities of students, some of them reaching their limit by the end of the first year of graduate work. To obtain an elaborate literary production would be very difficult in these days when so few can write the English language in accordance with accepted usage. Perhaps a translation might prove an agreeable substitute for a thesis in some cases, for it requires the intelligent use of two languages and a knowledge of the subject in hand. Professor George E. Howard, of the University of Nebraska, on the other hand, pleaded for the retention of the doctorate as a scholar's degree, declaring that the last decade has seen a decided improvement in the standard, that the present thesis is creditable, and that in American and English history it is better than the typical German thesis. He could not see the wisdom of establishing a new degree, but he did believe that the master's degree should be given more meaning, for it has a distinct academic function. The main thing is to keep the standards high. Professor N. M. Trenholme, of the University of Missouri, considered the present doctor's examination too severe for the students who have had no preparation for such an ordeal, and advocated making an examination for the master's degree a preliminary training for the doctor's examination. Professor J. M. Vincent spoke of the value of the work on the thesis in the intellectual development



of the student; to work over old topics may be good, but to do something new is better; the printing of theses is considered a reward of effort and industry. Professor C. M. Andrews advocated the maintenance of high standards for the degree. The result of not printing the theses would, he thought, be the cheapening of the degree; both the instructor and the student need the stimulus, the check, and the encouragement that come from the knowledge that the dissertation is to be printed and must bear the inspection of others. Subjects for theses should be wisely selected and suited to the needs of the science. Professor F. M. Fling believed we should have no inflexible rule about printing, and that college students should be so grounded in the principles of historical method and so taught by continuing practice to express their ideas that, when the need comes, they will be able to prepare a thesis in intelligent and readable English. Professor F. H. Hodder and Professor F. M. Anderson both dwelt on the desirability of strengthening the master's degree. Professor J. F. Jameson said we should adjust our degrees to American needs; the master's degree should indicate that its possessor has the scholarly preparation for teaching in secondary schools; the doctor's degree that he is fitted for the college. The person who is to handle college classes should have experienced the pains and pleasures of discovery and have ascertained by his own trials how history is written. Three-fourths of all theses, he said, are in American history, and of these the larger portion is good. Like Professor Andrews he believed the certainty that the dissertation would be inspected by others is of salutary influence, but thought it might possibly be wise not to print the dissertation, in a given case, if it were judged good by a professor in another university. Professor A. B. Hart said he had not seen the evil of the doctorate, for the educational development of recent years was due to the desire for the degree of doctor of philosophy and to the fact that it is a good standard measure for professional purposes. The dissertations had, moreover, added considerably to our knowledge; and he advocated that time be devoted to the study of topics that would yield positive and helpful results. Professor C. H. Haskins thought there had been a marked improvement in the real value of the doctorate, and that much more was asked than twenty years ago; he believed that standards should be raised for both the master's and the doctor's degrees, the latter to be given only to students showing unusual promise and likely to follow a university, as distinguished from a college, career. In a word, without establishing a new degree, the universities might well provide for the type of man that Professor Adams had in mind. At present we are in a transitional stage; and

while we provide fairly well for the future college professor, we do not do enough to develop the type of man who looks forward to a university career, and who should have the power and the training to conduct profitable investigation. At the end of the discussion, Professor Milyoukov, comparing the conditions in Russia with those prevailing here, said that the Russian degree of *magister* is as a rule obtained by men who are already too old, and that in his country the attainment of a degree is too difficult, and here too easy.

At the fourth session five papers were read on a variety of subjects. Professor C. W. Colby, of McGill University, characterized in an interesting manner the personnel and the work of the Historical Congress at St. Louis. Professor Ettore Pais, of the University of Naples, beginning with a tribute to the late Theodor Mommsen, and a reference to the marvelous breadth of his scholarship and the value of his contributions to Roman history, proceeded to point out the work that remains to be done. The soil of Italy still has many archæological treasures, and new discoveries will add new knowledge and raise fresh problems. The study of primitive life in other lands and the study of ancient law will throw light on the early development of Rome. Even for the study of the empire much remains to be done, for we know much more of the administrative system than of the real history of the people; we know more of their law than of their ideas, their moral movements, or their social development. Because of the similarity between the character and the history of modern America and those of ancient Rome, American scholars are especially called upon to study and interpret Roman life and history.

Professor Henry E. Bourne made a report upon the work of American historical societies, a summary of impressions received from the inquiry for the general committee of the Association. Describing with considerable care the different forms of organization and effort, he dwelt on the desirability of coöperation, and especially on the need of good understanding between the local societies and the general association. The next paper, by Professor E. G. Bourne, was a clever and interesting effort to test the trustworthiness of the *Travels* of Jonathan Carver by an application of the principles of modern historical criticism. Even the conclusions, not to speak of the proofs, cannot be given here in a word; and we must content ourselves with saying that Professor Bourne demonstrated that the book ascribed to Carver has no standing as a piece of first-hand testimony, that in all probability he did not write it, and that while portions were probably written by adroit literary hacks from Carver's own statements, much was but a rehearsal of the sayings of Charle-

voix and other early explorers, including the mendacious Lahontan. In the last paper of the evening, Mr. Isaac J. Cox, of the University of Cincinnati, spoke of the explorations in the southwest by Hunter, Dunbar, Pike, and Freeman in the first three years after the purchase of Louisiana. Although these expeditions were much less comprehensive than originally planned, they furnished valuable information concerning the geography of the territory, marked the first step in deflecting the border Indians from their nominal Spanish allegiance, and were a material factor in the final assertion of American claims to large portions of the southwest.

Professor Friedrich Keutgen, of Jena and Johns Hopkins, gave the first paper of the Friday morning session, on the necessity in America for the study of the early history of modern European nations. The real antecedents of America, he said, are to be found in the early life of the European nations, whose history is continuous from the time of their formation on the ruins of the older Roman world. But not for this reason alone, not from any merely patriotic motive, should American students study this early history, but because the backbone of every science is its method, and this method can best be learned where the materials are most easily mastered. In the early period of European history conditions were comparatively simple, and the evidence we have to handle can be tested by certain and intelligible rules. Opportunity is given for training and practice in paleography and diplomatics, while power of correct observation and inference can be developed in students with comparative ease. Professor Paul Milyoukov, formerly professor in the University of Sofia, read a paper on Russian historiography, in which he traced the periods through which the writing of history has passed from early days to the present. It is now, he said, under the influence of the wider sociological conceptions, to which American scholars have made notable contributions.

Following these papers by distinguished European historians, three papers were read, all describing certain archives and the materials to be found in them of particular interest to historical investigators. Professor A. C. McLaughlin, of the Carnegie Institution, gave the results of his investigation of the diplomatic archives of the Department of State. Confining his description to the period from 1789 to 1845, he pointed out the amount, character, and apparent interest of the great quantity of unpublished materials, which throw light not only on our diplomatic history but on conditions in foreign states. Special attention was called to the despatches of William Short, John Quincy Adams, and Jonathan Russell, and to the papers bearing on our diplomatic relations with the old republic of Texas.

Professor C. M. Andrews, of Bryn Mawr, described briefly the character of the material relating to American history to be found in the leading British archives, especially the Public Record Office, where exist great masses of documents, of some of which little has hitherto been known. For the internal history of the colonies in the seventeenth century documentary evidence is scanty, though of the highest importance; on the other hand, for the study of British colonial policy and the development of the organs of administration the evidence is of great extent and of corresponding value. The materials bearing on British trade and revenue, on the cost of general administration, and on the expense of managing the military are enormous, especially for the years 1745, 1755-1763, and for the Revolution. Professor Andrews also spoke appreciatively of the Stevens index, which contains references to more than 160,000 documents in England, France, Spain, and Holland relating to the period 1763-1783. Mr. Worthington C. Ford, of the Library of Congress, briefly described the extent and condition of the public archives at Manila and the richness of the papers in their historical features. While the great bulk of them is concerned with questions of local administration, the large collection of royal decrees and orders distinguish the archives from those obtained in previous acquisitions of Spanish territory. The insular government has appointed a keeper of the archives, and is taking measures for preserving the papers from further loss and damage, even sending a special student to Europe to obtain additional matter relating to the history of the Philippines. The Guam records, few in number and much mutilated, have in part been transferred to the Library of Congress, Washington, where they can receive greater care and attention. The archives of Porto Rico probably contain some material of value for historical purposes; but the archives of no dependency are complete, having suffered much in the past from carelessness and from changes of sovereignty or from revolution. The history of the Spanish colonial policy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is closely related to that of the British colonies in America, and should be studied in connection with the attempt of Spain to maintain a trading monopoly in the face of rivalry from England, France, and Holland.

The last session—a joint meeting with the Economic Association—was held on Friday evening in the building of the Northwestern University in the center of the city. Professor E. F. Gay, of Harvard, read a paper on the significance of the inclosure movement in England, an important contribution to the subject of English industrial history, its conclusions being in some respects quite at variance with those commonly accepted. The distinction should be made, the

speaker said, between the inclosure of common waste and the depopulating of the common fields, the former being much older and more wide-spread, but less disquieting than the latter. The depopulating inclosures of the common or open fields, especially characteristic of the sixteenth century, were not so serious a matter as contemporaries believed and almost all modern writers think. These inclosures were mainly confined to the midland counties; even there, till late in the eighteenth century, they were in general small piecemeal affairs, and the whole movement was one of gradual and not of violent change. Professor Gay brought out with especial distinctness the conditions under which this great agrarian change was made—the strong economic and social motives that tended to hasten it, and the equally strong obstacles, likewise economic and social, that retarded it. In conclusion he said that the comparison of the inclosure movements of the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries as usually made overlooks the continuity of the development in the different sections of England, and does not sufficiently take into account the differing social effects of the movements in the two periods.

After Professor Gay's paper, the rest of the evening was taken up with a discussion of the plan for preparing an Economic History of the United States. President Carroll D. Wright, head of the department of economics of the Carnegie Institution, who is responsible for the inception and the general management of the undertaking, briefly outlined the plans that have thus far been agreed upon. The whole field of American industrial history is divided into eleven main parts, and the general management of each one of these is in the hands of a competent person, whose duty it is to provide for the special investigation and the preparation of desirable monographs within his field. The divisions and the persons in charge of them are as follows: (1) Population and Immigration, Professor Walter F. Willcox; (2) Agriculture and Forestry, including public domain and irrigation, President Kenyon L. Butterfield; (3) Mining, Mr. Edward W. Parker; (4) Manufactures, President Wright; (5) Transportation, Professor B. H. Meyer; (6) Domestic and Foreign Commerce, Professor Emory R. Johnson; (7) Money and Banking, Professor Davis R. Dewey; (8) The Labor Movement, President Carroll D. Wright; (9) Industrial Organization, Professor J. W. Jenks; (10) Social Legislation, including provident institutions, insurance, and poor laws, Professor Henry W. Farnam; (11) Federal and State Finance, including taxation, Professor Henry B. Gardner. At the present time there are some seventy-five persons engaged in one capacity or another,

and it is expected that many more will soon be at work. It is plain from Colonel Wright's statement that his plan contemplates, at least for some time to come, the study of eleven or more parallel lines of industrial development, leaving any general scheme of coördination or combination to be dealt with at a later day. In the meantime, within these special fields where work is to be carried on by separate investigation, the work is to be in many, if not in most cases, decidedly monographic; and naturally the task must be that of collecting data, which at some future time can be properly arranged in chronological or logical relationships.

The general plan, as presented by President Wright, was commented on by several speakers, but the time was so limited that anything like a thorough discussion was impossible. The matter is one of such general interest, and the coöperation of historical scholars and economists so desirable, that it is regrettable that a thorough debate and interchange of views were impossible. Professor McMaster in a few luminous remarks called attention to the fact that real history in which events are brought out in their significant aspects cannot be written by following with precision any number of parallel lines. While such special treatment may be of much value, the investigator must remember that even in his choice of facts, as well as in their interpretation, much more must be considered than the changes taking place in one phase of human activity. In the period after the Revolution, for example, all social and industrial conditions had their bearing on Constitutional change and on the need of establishing a new political order. The ultimate effect of industrial conditions must affect the choice, arrangement, and presentation of facts. The next speaker, Professor C. H. Hull, of Cornell, fortifying his argument by the enumeration of various European and American examples, contended that among subsidized and coöperative undertakings of wide range, whether in ecclesiastical or in political history, those had proved on the whole most useful whose managers had confined their efforts chiefly to the editing of sources, and had left the production of coördinated narratives to the enterprise of individual writers and of commercial publishers. He maintained that this experience ought to have weight in planning the Economic History of the United States; and especially so because, unlike the official materials of ecclesiastical and political history, the materials of economic history do not become accessible after a few years as a matter of course. He therefore welcomed Colonel Wright's announcement that "the real and important work of the Department of Economics and Sociology of the Carnegie Institution is . . . to place the largest possible collection of

materials in the hands of both" the economist and the historian. Professor Henry R. Seager, of Columbia, spoke in approval of the general plan, and said that the work was properly undertaken by economists because the historians have as yet taken so little interest in the writing of economic history. He believed, however, that there were certain omissions, notably in the failure to provide for the study of the growth of trade in the ordinary sense as distinguished from commerce and transportation. Professor Jacob H. Hollander, of Johns Hopkins, said that the description of economic status rather than the narrative of economic development is the urgent need of economic study in the United States. Descriptive investigation, as distinct from historical study and local inquiry, must bear the same relation to political economy that field-work does to geology and the clinic does to medicine. The immediate environment should first be utilized as an economic laboratory for the development of scientific spirit in economic study and sound method in economic research, and as the field from which bases of working hypotheses may be derived. Thereafter the investigator must extend the range of his inquiry by visits to representative localities and even residence in them with a view to collecting wider and more varied data and to testing tentative conclusions. Such a procedure involves two essentials: leisure and resources. The investigators for scientific inquiry must certainly not be unduly absorbed by the routine engagement of the student or the teacher. With respect to resources, the investigator must be in command of funds sufficient to enable him to visit, and upon certain occasions temporarily to reside in representative localities for the purpose of gathering additional evidence and of testing and verifying tentative conclusions. Here seems to lie the present prime usefulness of private or public endowment in economic research.

The business meeting, which was held Friday afternoon, showed that the affairs of the Association are in their customary prosperous condition, and that the various committees and commissions are working with zeal and success. In accordance with the desire of the round-table conference of state and local historical societies, a conference of such societies was appointed to be held in connection with the next annual meeting. Mr. Thomas M. Owen was appointed chairman, and Professor Benjamin F. Shambaugh secretary. The request of the conference on the teaching of history in the elementary school was answered by a resolution favoring the appointment of a committee to investigate the subject and prepare a report on a course of history for elementary schools and the proper training of teachers for their work. The report of the treasurer, Dr. Clarence



W. Bowen, was not less gratifying than usual, showing the total assets of the Association to be \$22,477.69, an increase during the year, despite the heavy expenses incurred for the numerous activities of the Association, of \$1,243.99. The membership of the Association in 1904 was 2,163, an increase of 93 over the preceding year.

The report of the Pacific coast branch, which was transmitted by Professor Max Farrand, was filed with the records, and Professor H. Morse Stephens gave a statement concerning the numbers and the plans and purposes of the new western organization. One meeting, a very successful one, has been held in San Francisco, and it is intended to hold a meeting the coming year at Portland in connection with the Lewis and Clark celebrations. The present membership of the branch is 130. The committee on the Justin Winsor prize expressed its gratification at the general character and quality of the papers submitted, and announced the awarding of the prize to Mr. W. R. Manning, of Purdue University, for his monograph on the Nootka Sound Controversy, and that the monograph of Mr. C. O. Paullin on the Navy of the American Revolution had received honorable mention. The Association approved recommendations of the committee to the effect that more emphasis should be laid on the critical bibliography and that all mention of universities or former instructors should be omitted. Approval was likewise given the report of the committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams prize, which recommended that for the present the prize should be two hundred dollars, that it be awarded every second year, and that the rules governing the competition be practically the same as those in force for the Winsor prize competition. The prize is to be offered for the best monograph "based upon independent investigation in European history, by which is meant the history of Europe, continental or insular, or any part thereof".

Professor E. G. Bourne, in behalf of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, said that steps had been taken to edit and prepare for the printer the diplomatic correspondence of the republic of Texas. The editorial work is to be done by Professor George P. Garrison. In giving the report of the Public Archives Commission, Professor H. V. Ames said that the commission has representatives in thirty-two states and has already published one or more reports from eighteen states. Six additional reports will appear in the *Annual Report of the Association* for 1904, and other investigations are in progress. The work of the commission has helped the passage of laws in several of the states for the better preservation of the public records. Professor H. L. Osgood is editing the council journals of New York city, the proposed publication of which is directly trace-

able to his study of the records of the state in behalf of the commission. Dr. E. C. Richardson reported that the bibliographical committee had been engaged in making additions to the information collected by Professor W. H. Siebert concerning collections of material on European history in American libraries. At present the list is limited to special library collections and does not indicate individual books; but the committee intends to make up a list of two or three thousand of the great series, with indication of the libraries in which they may be found. The work of the General Committee consisted in preparing a list of persons eligible to membership in the Association, and of assisting the committee on the programme of the Chicago meeting in arranging for a conference of representatives of state and local historical societies. The success of the conference led to the appointment of a subcommittee, composed of Dr. R. G. Thwaites and Professors B. F. Shambaugh and F. L. Riley, with the special task of reporting at a further conference upon the best methods of organization and work on the part of state and local historical societies. The General Committee, in addition to its usual duties, will undertake the preparation of a list of those members who are engaged in research, classifying them according to the fields in which they are at work. The committee will also investigate, in connection with other historical societies, the extent to which historic sites have been marked or otherwise accurately determined.

The Association voted to meet the coming year in Baltimore and Washington, and in Providence in 1906. The committee on nominations, composed of Professors F. J. Turner, Charles H. Hull, and A. L. P. Dennis, proposed a list of officers, all of whom were chosen by the Association. Professor John B. McMaster was chosen president; Judge Simeon E. Baldwin, first vice-president; and Professor J. Franklin Jameson, second vice-president. Mr. A. Howard Clark, Professor Charles H. Haskins, and Dr. Clarence W. Bowen were reëlected to their former positions. In the place of Dr. Herbert Putnam and Professor F. J. Turner, who had served three years on the Council, were chosen Professor George P. Garrison and Dr. Reuben G. Thwaites.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
ASSOCIATION.

<i>President,</i>	Professor John Bach McMaster, Philadelphia.
<i>First Vice-president,</i>	Judge Simeon Eben Baldwin, New Haven, Conn.

<i>Second Vice-president,</i>	Professor J. Franklin Jameson, Chicago, Ill.
<i>Secretary,</i>	A. Howard Clark, Esq., Smith- sonian Institution, Washing- ton.
<i>Corresponding Secretary,</i>	Professor Charles H. Haskins, 15 Prescott Hall, Cam- bridge, Mass.
<i>Treasurer,</i>	Clarence Winthrop Bowen, Esq., 130 Fulton St., New York.

*Executive Council* (in addition to above-named officers):

Hon. Andrew Dickson White, <sup>1</sup>	Henry Charles Lea, Esq., <sup>1</sup>
President James Burrill Angell, <sup>1</sup>	Goldwin Smith, Esq., <sup>1</sup>
Henry Adams, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor George L. Burr,
James Schouler, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor Edward P. Cheyney,
Professor George Park Fisher, <sup>1</sup>	Professor Edward G. Bourne,
James Ford Rhodes, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor A. C. McLaughlin,
Charles Francis Adams, Esq., <sup>1</sup>	Professor George P. Garrison,
Captain Alfred Thayer Mahan, <sup>1</sup>	Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq.

*Committees:*

*Finance Committee:* Hon. James H. Eckels, Chicago, Ill., chairman, and Hon. Peter White.

*Committee on Programme for the Twenty-first Meeting:* Professor John M. Vincent, Johns Hopkins University, chairman, Professors Charles M. Andrews, Francis A. Christie, Charles H. Haskins, and Andrew C. McLaughlin.

*Joint Local Committee of Arrangements for the American Historical Association, American Economic Association, and American Political Science Association:* Theodore Marburg, Esq., Baltimore, Md., chairman, Professors Jacob H. Hollander, John M. Vincent, and Westel W. Willoughby (with power to add members at the discretion of the chairman).

*Committee on the Entertainment of Ladies at the Twenty-first Meeting:* Mrs. Annie M. L. Sioussat, Baltimore, Md., chairman, and Miss Ida M. Tarbell (with power to add auxiliary members at the discretion of the chairman).

*Editors of the American Historical Review:* Professors H. Morse Stephens, George B. Adams, J. Franklin Jameson, William M. Sloane, Albert Bushnell Hart, and Andrew C. McLaughlin.

<sup>1</sup> Ex-president.

*Historical Manuscripts Commission:* Professor Edward G. Bourne, Yale University, chairman, Professor Frederick W. Moore, Reuben Gold Thwaites, Esq., Worthington C. Ford, Esq., Professor Andrew C. McLaughlin, and Thomas M. Owen, Esq.

*Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize:* Professor Charles M. Andrews, Bryn Mawr College, chairman, Roger Foster, Esq., Professors Edward P. Cheyney, Charles H. Hull, and Williston Walker.

*Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize:* Professor Charles Gross, Harvard University, chairman, Professors George L. Burr, Victor Coffin, James Harvey Robinson, and John M. Vincent.

*Public Archives Commission:* Professor Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania, chairman, Professors William MacDonald, Herbert L. Osgood, Charles M. Andrews, and Edwin E. Sparks.

*Committee on Bibliography:* Ernest C. Richardson, Esq., Princeton University, chairman, A. P. C. Griffin, Esq., George Iles, Esq., William C. Lane, Esq., Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq., and Professor Max Farrand.

*Committee on Publications:* Professor Charles H. Haskins, Harvard University, chairman, A. Howard Clark, Esq., Professors Fred M. Fling, Samuel M. Jackson, Elizabeth K. Kendall, Anson D. Morse, and Earle W. Dow.

*General Committee:* Professor Henry E. Bourne, Western Reserve University, chairman, Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq., President Lilian W. Johnson, Professors Charles H. Haskins, Lucy M. Salmon, John S. Bassett, William MacDonald, Frank H. Hodder, Franklin L. Riley, Benjamin F. Shambaugh, and Frederick G. Young (with power to add adjunct members).

*Committee on History in Elementary Schools:* Professor J. A. James, Northwestern University, chairman, Wilbur F. Gordy, Esq., Superintendent of Schools, Springfield, Mass., Miss Mabel Hill, Lowell Normal School, J. H. Van Sickle, Esq., Superintendent of Schools, Baltimore, Md., E. C. Brooks, Esq., Superintendent of Schools, Goldsboro, N. C., Professors Henry E. Bourne, Western Reserve University, Julius Sachs, Teachers College, Columbia University, and Henry W. Thurston, Chicago Normal School.

## THE TREATMENT OF HISTORY<sup>1</sup>

BEFORE entering on my subject let me congratulate the Association and Americans generally on the striking progress made by the study of history here in the course of the last half-century. To the names of Bancroft, Hildreth, Prescott, and Palgrave have been added those of Henry C. Lea, Henry Adams, James Ford Rhodes, John B. McMaster, John Fiske, James Schouler, Moses Coit Tyler, W. M. Sloane, Charles Francis Adams, and Woodrow Wilson. The progress shows itself alike in style, in research, and in fairness of judgment. In the style even of Bancroft there lingers something rather too rhetorical, too much savoring of the Fourth of July. Conscientious research has advanced with great strides. It has perhaps been carried almost to the point of exaggeration by researches into the history of obscure municipal institutions. But the excess is infinitely better than the defect.

In fairness and candor also there has been a vast improvement, specially to be noted in the treatment of questions with Great Britain. The Revolution, the War of 1812, and relations with England generally receive far more equitable treatment now than they did of yore. The other day a cry was raised in England that the American school-histories are poisoning the minds of Americans against us. Somebody proposed to deal with the subject specially and to stanch the source of rancor. I sent for a number of school-histories and examined them. In those of forty or fifty years ago the angry spirit was manifest; but it decreased as the present time was approached, and in the school-histories of the present day little I believe will be found of which an Englishman could fairly complain. From the taint of national arrogance English histories would hardly be found free. Too much space is given to war. Too much space perhaps is given to war in all histories. War is still unhappily of all themes the most exciting. It is the best-suited for lively description; it strikes the imagination of itself without calling for much skill on the part of the writer. Genius perhaps may some day make the annals of peaceful and beneficent achievement interesting even to boys. If I found any special fault with the American school-his-

<sup>1</sup> The President's address to the American Historical Association, December 28, 1904.

tories, it was not that they were rancorous, but that they were dry. For writing children's books special genius is required.

In proceeding to deal with the treatment of history, we are met at once by the question whether history is or can be made a science. Expectations of this kind are the natural offspring of the vast conquests which science has been making and which seem to proclaim its empire universal. We are confronted at once by the everlasting problem of free will. Human history may be the subject of philosophy; the subject of science it can hardly be if the human will is free. I trust it is not presumptuous to say that this question of free will and necessity seems to me to be a mental puzzle and nothing more. In every action our consciousness, if we appeal to it, tells us that there are two elements: the antecedents or motive, and the volition. In every action which is doubtful or unusual or which calls for a special effort of will we are distinctly conscious of the volition as well as of the antecedents. In habitual and commonplace actions we are not conscious of the volition unless our attention is specially called to it. But always the two elements are there; and upon the presence of the volition depend our retrospective judgments on our own actions and our judgments on the actions of our neighbors. The volition could not take place without the antecedents, nor will the antecedents produce action without the volition. It is difficult, probably impossible, to designate the exact relation between them; hence the puzzle, hence the question about which such controversies have raged. Huxley, biased by physical science, took at one time the extreme necessarian view. But if I mistake not, he had latterly ceased to feel so sure that man was an automaton which had automatically fancied itself a free agent but had automatically come back to the belief that after all it was an automaton. His superb good-sense prevailed.

There is apparently another serious difficulty in attempting to treat human history as a science. To base a valid induction we must have the phenomena completely before us. But human history is not yet complete, nor do we know how far it may be from completion or what phenomena its progress may be destined to disclose. Comte traces, as he thinks, the history of man through three stages: the theological, the metaphysical, and the positive, with their subdivisions, and assumes that the positive stage is final. He accordingly proceeds to give the world a form of government, a form of religion, a calendar of social worthies, permanent institutions of different kinds. But his finality is without reasonable warrant. The era which he styles positive may not be the last. Destiny may have totally new developments in store. At all events it is not likely

that a government, a religion, or a calendar of worthies framed by a man of this generation will serve for generations yet to come.

Besides, human history is full of accidents baffling to theory as well as to calculation. By the merest accident Napoleon becomes a French citizen. It seems that he had at one time thought of enlisting in the British navy. Had he been shot on the bridge of Lodi or assassinated by Georges Cadoudal, both of which events were perfectly possible, the whole current of history would have been changed. Gustavus Adolphus is in the full career of victory, which to a moral certainty would have ended in the redemption of Germany. A wreath of mist comes over the field of Lützen and separates him from his troops. He falls, and half Germany remains Catholic. Napoleon, it is true, would not have been what he was or have done what he did without predisposing forces. But the predisposing forces would not have produced the events without Napoleon, whose appearance on the scene, as it could not possibly have been foretold, was, if anything is, a chance. Such instances might be multiplied without number, and they are apparently fatal to the conception and verification of any scientific law.

For the philosophy of history which traces the interdependence of events, the connection of causes and effects, the operation of special influences general or personal, permanent or temporary, the distinction of epochs, the formation of national character, and above all the general progress of humanity, it is needless to say there is a vast, fruitful, and highly cultivated field.

Here perhaps may be noticed the view which seems to be held by my very eminent predecessor in the presidency of the Association, Mr. Henry C. Lea, as to the division of history into moral epochs. Mr. Lea appears to think that it is irrational and unjust to condemn Philip II and the inquisitors of the day for putting people to death on account of their religious belief, such having been the moral law of that epoch. This view would seem to lead to the division of history into a series of moral zones with which our judgments of action and character ought to vary. But such a conception would surely be fatal to morality itself, as it would destroy the identity of the moral law. In judging individual character and action just allowance must of course be made for the general beliefs and prevailing influences of the time. But this is the limit of condonation. The age of Philip II and the Spanish Inquisition was an age of murderous persecution. What made it so? The conduct of Philip II and the inquisitors, which itself was influenced not solely by hatred of misbelief but by criminal propensities of a grosser kind: the despot's lust of unlimited power, the hierarch's lust of ascend-



ancy and wealth. Philip II was not only a persecutor, he was a murderer and an adulterer. He hired assassins to take the life of his noble enemy William the Silent. It is by no means certain that the propensity to religious murder was universal or even general among the people of that day. Nor was morality on this subject without a witness. Erasmus, invoking the judgment of Europe on the execution of Sir Thomas More, pleaded that no one during More's chancellorship had suffered death for heresy. More in his *Utopia* advocates the broadest principle of religious toleration. Can it be supposed that William the Silent or Henry IV would have burned people alive for misbelief? Was not the reaction in England against Queen Mary and her religion largely caused by the fires of Smithfield?

Comte's series of historic epochs, distinguished by the progress of ideas from the theological and the metaphysical to the positive, cannot, it seems to me, be really identified; though, like many theories incapable of perfect verification, it has shed important light on the subject. The identification of the metaphysical era is especially difficult. But I must not attempt the discussion of this complicated question here. I confine myself to the recognition of Comte's merits as an earnest thinker and a devoted servant of humanity. Vico's theory of historic cycles now hardly calls for examination; though Vico may claim the honor of having been the first to treat history philosophically, unless we include in philosophies of history a religious survey such as that of Bossuet or an observation of political sequences such as that in the *Politics* of Aristotle.

The crown of science is prediction. Were history a science, it would enable us to predict events. It is needless to say that the forecast of even the most sagacious of public men is often totally at fault with regard to the immediate future. On the brink of the great Revolutionary wars Pitt looked forward with confidence to a long continuance of peace. Palmerston, if he was rightly reported, deemed the cause of German unification hopeless at the moment when Bismarck was coming on the scene and unification was at hand.

The philosophy of history, on the other hand, without affecting the character or claiming the prerogatives of a science, but simply resting on the identity of human nature, traces past effects to their causes and from the continuance or recurrence of the cause predicts a recurrence of the effect. It discloses the interaction and the nature of all the forces and influences of which past history has been the outcome, ranging them in their order and trying to assign to each its part in the product. It frequently takes the form of separate treatises. But no historical work which shows the sequence of

events, nothing in short that is really history and not merely a chronicle, can be without philosophy.

Writers on the philosophy of history are in danger of overstating the effect of some particular cause the importance of which they are or seem to themselves to be the first to recognize. Buckle, for instance, in a work which produced a great effect in its day, seems sometimes to overrate the influence of natural phenomena of a striking kind in the formation of national character. He traces, for example, the religious character of the Spaniards to the impression made on them by the terrors of volcanoes and earthquakes. But there appear to be no records to show that in the formative period of Spanish character volcanic phenomena greatly prevailed. The religious character of the Spaniard was formed largely by the long conflict with the Moors, as was that of the Russians by the long conflict with the heathen Tartars. Volcanic phenomena do not seem to have affected the character of the Japanese. Italian character in its Roman phase was, and in its Catholic phase is, the manifest outcome of historical causes quite independent of Vesuvius. Among the sources of Scotch character Buckle reckons the influence of thunder-storms and of the reverberations of the thunder among the mountains. But the mountains are in the Celtic Highlands, and the Scottish character is that of the Lowland Teuton; not to say that, if I may trust the experience of a shooting-season, thunder-storms are far from frequent among the Scotch mountains. The backwardness of native American civilization is ascribed to absence of animals of draft or burden. That may have been a partial cause. But the ruined cities of Central America show that much might have been done by human labor; so apparently do the great monuments of Egypt.

I have read an ingenious work on the philosophy of history which ascribes everything to the struggle for subsistence and the conflict between economical classes to which it gives birth. The theory is taken as the key even to religious revolutions, such as that of England in the time of Charles I. The landowners, it is remarked, were mainly on the one side, the yeomanry on the other. Only to a limited extent was this the fact. But it can hardly be questioned that religious convictions and the political tendencies allied with them were the fundamental motives. Subsistence is of course the basis of all, and the division into economical classes is of the highest importance. But the sharpness of the division and its influence on the course of civilization are capable of overstatement. Not all consumers are producers, though the vast majority of them are, but all producers must be consumers; so society can hardly be divided on

that line. The vast and infinitely complex frame with its boundless variety of influences and circumstances, while it affords abundant matter for fruitful remark, defies sweeping generalization. None of the sweeping generalizations, at least so far, has held its ground.

Again, we have a philosopher of mark who holds the apparently paradoxical doctrine that man has advanced by disregarding the dictates of his individual reason. That progress has been largely due to the action of man against his propensities and his apparent interest is true enough. All self-sacrifice, patriotic devotion, and religious martyrdom may be so described. But reason comprehends the whole of the mental antecedents to action, whether selfish or unselfish or of whatever kind they may be; and we can no more act against the whole of the mental antecedents to action than a man can jump out of his skin.

Of Carlyle, what is to be said? Is his view of history to be called philosophy or poetry? A serious philosophy of history it certainly cannot be called. "As I take it, Universal History, the history of what man has accomplished in this world, is at bottom the History of the Great Men who have worked here. They were the leaders of men, these great ones; the modellers, patterns, and in a wide sense creators, of whatsoever the general mass of men contrived to do or to attain; all things that we see standing accomplished in the world are properly the outer material result, the practical realisation and embodiment, of Thoughts that dwelt in the Great Men sent into the world: the soul of the whole world's history, it may justly be considered, were the history of these."<sup>1</sup> This evidently is not philosophy. Great men were not creators, but the consummate products of their generation, giving its tendencies the fullest expression, and reacting upon it by the force of their genius. But they were its offspring, not its creators. What would Odin, if there was such a man, have been without Norse tendencies and beliefs? What would Mahomet have been without Arabian tribalism, Judaism, and Christianity? What would Luther have been without the ferment of spiritual insurrection against Rome which had long before produced Wycliffe? What would Shakespeare have been without the Elizabethan era, Voltaire without his century, Napoleon without the Revolution and the outbreak of military adventure which ensued? Carlyle's preaching has been well described as an alterative. His sentiment was a revolt, and probably a seasonable revolt, against triumphant and self-complacent democracy in all its phases, historical as well as actual, intellectual as well as political and social. Democracy's thirty millions of voters to Carlyle seem

<sup>1</sup> *Heroes and Hero-Worship*, Lecture 1.

mostly fools, owing everything that is good or sensible about them to the great men, who he says are "sent" into the world, not born of it, to be its guiding lights. There is no doubt that democratic optimism and the worship of the ballot-box after the triumph of Parliamentary reform in England had about them something repulsive, particularly to Carlyle. Both his antipathy and his worship were carried to the pitch almost of frenzy. Cromwell, generally humane in war, deplores the slaughter at Drogheda as a sad necessity. Carlyle exults in it and asks us whether we dare wed the heaven's lightning. But it is in his *Frederick the Great* that his fancy breaks all bounds. Frederick's ability, military or political, nobody questions. As a king he was progressive, made good reforms, such as the abolition of torture, and above all proclaimed liberty of conscience. On the other hand, he went to war, as himself avowed, to win himself a name, and, having no title to Silesia other than his worshiper's mystic "destiny", plunged Europe into a war of twenty years. Carlyle puts morality under his idol's feet. When sophistry breaks down, he flies off into rhapsody. There is a memorable passage in *Sartor Resartus* denouncing and deriding the barbarism of war. But in the *Frederick the Great* humanity disappears and gives place to a sentiment bordering on the brutal.

At the same time let me emphatically acknowledge Carlyle's greatness as a teacher of history. In picturesqueness he has hardly a peer. Still more strikingly unique and a greater mark of genius are the breadth and boldness with which he presents the whole of humanity with all its weaknesses and absurdities, with its comic and laughable as well as its tragic and pathetic side. This is an invaluable feature of his *History of the French Revolution*, a work which, though perhaps not strictly accurate in all its details, is in depth of insight, in breadth of treatment, as well as in picturesqueness and vividness still without a rival. I would venture to commend it as a valuable training in its way for the historic sense.

To lay down any rules for the writing of history seems impossible. The style must vary with the subject, with the genius of the writer, with the intelligence of the reader. To be generally read any work must obviously be interesting to ordinary minds. There is perhaps rather a tendency in this scientific and sociological age to underrate the value of narrative skill. Stubbs's *Constitutional History of England*, which is treated as the paragon, is indeed admirable and invaluable as a work of research. But for anybody but an earnest student it is hardly readable. Hume has been severely lashed by Freeman and others of that austere school for his inaccuracies; no doubt with justice. But it is to be borne in mind

that by the attractiveness of his style and his art as a narrator he made history popular and has imparted to countless readers a knowledge of it, true as to the main facts, though in some particulars incorrect. The same may be said of Robertson, whose *Charles the Fifth* is a broad and luminous treatment of a great subject, superseded no doubt in many respects by writers who have had access to further information, yet a good service rendered to the study of history in its day. Moreover, to instruct, touch, and elevate humanity a history must be human. It must be a lively presentation of character and action. Sociology is a thing by itself. So is every historical treatise written on the sociological principle. So are those special treatises on an infinite variety of subjects in which character and action have no place. If history ever does become science, a historical work will take the form of a scientific treatise. Reasons have been offered for doubting whether that day will ever come.

Macaulay, himself the most brilliant of historians, in his essay on "History" says that to be a really great historian is perhaps the rarest of intellectual distinctions. "The cause", he says, "may easily be assigned. This province of literature is a debateable land. It lies on the confines of two distinct territories. It is under the jurisdiction of two hostile powers; and, like other districts similarly situated, it is ill-defined, ill cultivated, and ill regulated. Instead of being equally shared between its two rulers, the Reason and the Imagination, it falls alternately under the sole and absolute dominion of each. It is sometimes fiction. It is sometimes theory. History, it has been said, is philosophy teaching by examples. Unhappily what the philosophy gains in soundness and depth, the examples generally lose in vividness. A perfect historian must possess an imagination sufficiently powerful to make his narrative affecting and picturesque. Yet he must control it so absolutely as to content himself with the materials which he finds, and to refrain from supplying deficiencies by additions of his own. He must be a profound and ingenious reasoner. Yet he must possess sufficient self-command to abstain from casting his facts in the mould of his hypothesis. Those who can justly estimate these almost insuperable difficulties will not think it strange that every writer should have failed, either in the narrative or in the speculative department of history."<sup>1</sup>

Here, I think, we have a specimen of that love of antithesis which is rather a weakness of Macaulay. Setting aside Macaulay himself, it surely would be hard to say of Gibbon that he had failed in combining the philosophic with the narrative element. Exception may

<sup>1</sup> *Edinburgh Review*, May, 1828, 331.

reasonably be taken to his philosophy as an inadequate and unfair treatment of Christianity, the really great motive-power of the period. But the art with which the philosophy is combined with the narrative seems to be complete. The same apparently may be said of Tacitus, whose style is unapproachable, partly perhaps because the language in which he wrote was imperial. The loss of the greater part of Tacitus's works is the greatest calamity of literature. Thucydides employs as the vehicles of his philosophy fictitious speeches, for which Macaulay severely censures him. But Thucydides can hardly be said to pretend that the speeches are real; and his employment of them may be regarded with interest as the first attempt at a philosophy of history.

We must expect writers of history to be of their age and country. In the sentiment and style of Mommsen's *History of Rome* we perceive Germany passing from the metaphysical to the militant and hear the tramp of the German armies marching on Paris. Voltaire, Hume, Renan, Gibbon, Michelet, and on the other hand Montalembert, are redolent of the influences of their time.

I must not omit to mention so important an event in the study of history as the appearance of the *Cambridge Modern History*, planned by the late Lord Acton and commenced under the auspices of that prince of students. The work seems to be truly described in the introduction as a "series of monographs, conceived on a connected system," which, "instead of presenting a collection of fragments, possesses a definite unity of its own. . . . Each separate writer treats of a subject with which he is familiar, and is freed from any other responsibility than that of setting forth clearly the salient features of . . . [his] period. . . . He may follow any line of investigation of his own, and may supply links of connexion at his will. He may receive suggestions from different minds, and may pursue them. . . . He is free at the same time from the aridity of a chronological table. . . . Each subject or period has a natural coherence of its own."<sup>1</sup> Complete harmony among the minds of different contributors cannot be expected. Nor can we look for the interest of a flowing and lively narrative. What the work rather claims to be is an aid to exact and comprehensive study, and this function it may be expected to perform. There is a copious bibliography for each part. I cannot pass by the work due to the inspiration of my illustrious friend without deploring, as a student of history, the immense treasure of historic knowledge which has been buried in that grave.

Let us treat the subject as we may, scientifically, philosophically, or in any other method, what can we make of the history of man?

<sup>1</sup> *The Cambridge Modern History*, I, 5.

Is the race the creation of a directing Providence, or a production of blind Nature on this planet, fortuitous in its course and in its end? We have, preceding the birth of man, eons, it may be almost said, of abortion; eons of animal races which destroyed each other or perished on the primeval globe; a glacial era; man at length brought into existence, but remaining, perhaps for countless generations, a savage, and afterward a barbarian; wild tribal conflicts and cataclysms of barbarian conquest. Then comes the dawn of civilization, which even now has spread over only a portion of the race, and even for that portion has been retarded and marred by wars, revolutions, persecutions, crimes and aberrations of every kind, besides plagues, earthquakes, and other calamities of nature. Through all this mankind, or at least the leading members of the race, have been struggling onward to social, moral, perhaps spiritual life. Are things tending to a result answerable to the long preparation, the immense effort, and the boundless suffering which the preparation and the effort have involved? Or will the end of all be the physical catastrophe which science tells us must close the existence of the material scene? That question not even a *Cambridge Modern History* attempts to answer.

GOLDWIN SMITH.



## METHODS OF WORK IN HISTORICAL SEMINARIES

THE historical seminary is now thoroughly domesticated in America. An entire generation has passed since it was first introduced, and we have already left behind the period of callow youth.<sup>1</sup> It is no longer supposed, I think, that its methods, or what may pass as its methods, are in place in every stage of education from the grammar-school up, or that its name may be rightly applied to all sorts of exercises, from genial comment on some standard historian by the instructor, to a club which listens to occasional papers from its members and lectures from distinguished visitors, or to the private consultation hour of the professor. We have come to recognize more intelligently the real purpose and plan of the seminary and to understand the methods of work which are proper to it.

No one is likely, I think, to dispute the proposition that the true object of seminary work is to train the historical investigator. This does not mean that every member of the seminary is expected to become a writer of history from the sources, or cherishes indeed such an ambition; but trained critical judgment, which is as valuable to

<sup>1</sup> The earliest true seminary work done in this country, so far as I have been able to ascertain, although it was not called by that name, was that done under the direction of Professor Henry Adams, of Harvard University, in 1874-1876, which resulted in the publication of the volume of *Essays in Anglo-Saxon Law* in 1876 by himself and his pupils. A description of the way in which this work was conducted, which I owe to the kindness of Professor J. Laurence Laughlin, makes it clear that it was seminary work of a high order of merit, as may easily be seen from the *Essays*, and that it was a combination of the methods which I have numbered two and three. The historical seminary by that name was first introduced into this country in the University of Michigan by Professor Charles Kendall Adams in 1871. See H. B. Adams, *The Study of History in American Colleges and Universities*, Bureau of Education, 1887, pp. 104-110, and W. Dawson Johnston in the *Inlander*, students' monthly of the University of Michigan, December, 1896, pp. 104-113. It is evident, however, from Professor C. K. Adams's account of the work done in his seminary during its earlier years that it hardly comes under the description of the seminary given above. See Adams, *The Study of History*, 109, and Johnston, in the *Inlander*, 1896, p. 106. It was made up of undergraduate students, it studied general and not special problems, and its object was the training of the citizen and the lawyer rather than the historical scholar. It was a very great improvement, however, on the undergraduate instruction usual at that day, and there is no doubt that the example of Professor Adams in taking this step had great influence on the introduction of the true seminary. Probably the strongest influence exerted to this end was that of Professor Herbert B. Adams during the early years of his connection with Johns Hopkins University.

the secondary-school instructor as to the university professor, is the incidental though necessary result of seminary work which is sought by all. The primary object is not to teach the facts of history but to teach the correct methods of dealing with the raw material from which the facts must be determined; of first judging its character and value; then of extracting from it all that it has to tell us, and not more than this; of determining as accurately as possible the degree of probability which attaches to the result; and finally of combining the conclusions reached into a systematic and comprehensive whole. An essential characteristic of the work is the practice of these methods together by a number of students of about the same stage of advancement, and the resulting mutual criticism and stimulus of mind by mind. Any process by which the same results are reached in the individual student by himself, however effective it may be in scholarly training, is not properly to be called seminary work. Nor, in fact, are any of the incidental results—such as a knowledge of bibliography and the tools of the trade, or the ability to distinguish among the new books appearing from time to time those of real and serious scholarship from those that have the form but not the substance—valuable as these may be considered, the direct objects sought. The real object of seminary work is the training of the investigator, and the methods to be considered here are those that have this for their result and no others.

The methods most frequently employed in historical seminaries may, I think, be brought into three classes, which I name from what seems to be a distinguishing characteristic of each:<sup>1</sup> (1) the intensive analysis method, in which the work consists primarily in the minute scrutiny and comparison of a small body of closely-related material, or even of a single document; (2) the comparison and combination method, in which a group of connected sources of considerable extent, or a single one like a chronicle, is made the foundation of a series of studies; and (3) the essay method, in which the work is done in essays on assigned topics prepared by members of the seminary.

The characterization of seminary methods attempted in these names can be considered satisfactory only in a rough and tentative way, but it may perhaps serve the purpose of a preliminary classi-

<sup>1</sup> In this, which is, so far as I know, a first attempt at classifying the methods commonly employed in seminary instruction, I cannot hope to have reached a final result, either in describing all the species of method, or in correctly indicating the points of strength or weakness in each, nor even perhaps in the number and distinguishing marks of the genera formed. I shall be greatly obliged if instructors and students of experience will send me such suggestions and criticisms as occur to them.

fication. The description attached to the names is also to be regarded as generic only. Under each of the classes will be found in practice a considerable number of species—more or less varying forms, but having in common the characteristics named. There will also be found some forms in which the characteristics of two, possibly of all three, of these classes have been adopted. Such variations may be disregarded as not affecting the purpose here in view; in general, from emphasizing the method of one or the other class, they fall in reality into that class.

By the term intensive analysis I have intended to characterize that method in which the work during each session of the seminary consists chiefly in the minute and careful internal analysis of a single document or of a group of closely-related documents or passages by all the members of the seminary working in common. After the preliminary study of the character and history of the material used, the object of the work is to extract from it the utmost that it may be made to yield, directly or by inference, each document singly or by a comparison of several; to ascertain the dividing line between safe and unsafe inference in each instance; and to formulate the result in as definite a conclusion as possible. It is especially characteristic of this method that each member of the seminary is expected to contribute voluntarily his judgment, reasons, or objections, or may be at any moment called upon for them. In seminaries of this class it is not necessary, and it often is not the case, that the topic of one week's work should be related to that of another, but a semester's work may easily be made to follow a systematic line of development if desired. It is also never the case that special assignments are made to individual members of the seminary.<sup>1</sup> The same material and problems are assigned to all; and, while every man must prepare himself in advance—and the more successfully the instructor conducts the course the more complete must be the preparation—it is essential that the whole work, from raw material to conclusion, should be carried on during the hours of the session by all.

Seminaries employing mainly or wholly these methods are far less numerous than those using the forms of the second and third

<sup>1</sup> The advantage of individual assignment is that more thorough and complete study is possible, which serves, so far as that one preparation goes, as a better training for the student and as an example and model to the other members of the course. This advantage can be secured in this method of work only by making the subject of each exercise a comparatively brief one, by carefully selecting such documents as are capable of thorough study in a short time, and by supplementing the work which the members of the seminary have done in preparation by the work which is done during the session. It must be noticed, however, that this advantage is only one, and that not the most important, of the many to be sought in seminary work.

classes. Peculiar and not very common qualities are demanded of the instructor if the work is to be made successful. He must himself possess the power of minute and keen analysis, of sharp insight into the meaning of his material. He must be able to see readily the bearing of one portion of it on another or of different documents on each other, and also to see quickly and clearly what is implied but not said in the language used. And yet this must be all under the control of a sound faculty of critical judgment, constantly exercised in all directions, which will not allow these processes to be carried too far, and especially will not suffer too much to be seen which is not expressed—the peculiar danger of this method of investigation. He must be willing to make very thorough preparation of his material in advance and to hold back his conclusions while his seminary works through to conclusions of its own, and even to hold his own freely subject to modification or rejection in view of the new suggestions constantly coming forward. He must be able to weigh quickly the value of such new suggestions, to help onward the half-formed thought and to expose the weakness of the wrong or fruitless suggestion, to impress on every one the points of criticism and method constantly arising, and to keep the work moving rapidly and all the members of the seminary at work to the full.

It is probably true that in this list of qualities I have stated the ideal rather than anything that has ever been attained in actual practice, but it is certainly true that qualities like these are demanded to make this method successful.<sup>1</sup> With them or something near them,

<sup>1</sup> At the time I was at the University of Leipzig, it was a student tradition that the seminary method of Professor Wilhelm Arndt, which was of this class, was one which he had learned in the seminary of Professor Georg Waitz, and that it reproduced by direct descent through him Ranke's original seminary method. That this was Waitz's only seminary method can, I think, hardly be true. See Monod, *Portraits et Souvenirs* (Paris, 1897), 101. Waitz's own description of his seminary method, with its brief remark about Ranke's, and showing that this was a favorite but not the sole method with him, is worth quoting at length, as it is not easy of access:

"Einen bestimmten Schriftsteller gelesen haben wir bei Ihnen zu meiner Zeit nicht, dass ich erinnere: später soll es häufiger geschehen sein. Ich habe nur in einzelnen Semestern an einen oder den andern mittelalterlichen Autor angeknüpft, Nithard, Liudprand, Adam von Bremen. Zu andern Zeiten haben uns Rechtsdenkmäler, Stellen der Lex Salica, des Sachsenspiegels, oder wichtigere Urkunden der Verfassungsgeschichte, die Constitutio de expeditione Romana, der Landfriede von 1235, das Decret über die Papstwahl, die Magna Carta, beschäftigt. Lieber noch habe ich kleine oder grössere Untersuchungen über einzelne Fragen der Quellenkritik oder der Geschichte selbst in den Zusammenkünften vorgenommen und habe sie schrittweise mit den Theilnehmern durchgeführt: manche kleine Abhandlung, die später veröffentlicht ward, ist so entstanden. Besonderen Werth aber habe ich immer darauf gelegt, dass die älteren Mitglieder selbständige Arbeiten unternahmen. Die Wahl des Gegen-

this method of seminary work is without question, I think, far the most effective in teaching the details of historical criticism and in training the critical judgment. No other raises so many different points and so many different kinds of points in the seminary session; no other goes so completely over the whole field of method or requires of the members of the seminary such constant exercise of scientific judgment under the sharp criticism of others. It has, however, one serious defect. It gives little, almost no, opportunity for constructive work. The problems which it discusses are usually limited in scope; it is not always easy to employ it, in its simple form, in such a way as to cover all the necessary details of a long and systematic development of either institutions or events; and it does not often give results that admit of more than brief statement. True constructive work, the process of creating out of an extensive and complicated mass of materials a well-proportioned and critically sound account, in which certainly the coming historian should have the best of training, it gives but little opportunity to practise.

The question is sometimes asked, whether the process of minute analysis which this method especially emphasizes can be applied to the material of modern history, and whether training of this sort is necessary to the modern historian. That there is a difference in character between the material of modern and of medieval history is certainly true. For one thing, the statements of modern sources are more full, more words are used, the whole thought is more nearly expressed, and there is less taken for granted which has to be extracted by the process of inference. For another thing, the sources bearing on the given historical transaction are likely to be far more numerous and of a larger number of kinds. What one leaves unsaid will in all probability be said by another; the student

standes überlasse ich gerne jedem selbst: auch das ist schon ein Theil der Arbeit. . . . So weit es geht, haben die Mitglieder unter einander Kritik zu üben; wo das nicht ausreicht, suche ich selber nachzuhelfen, . . . [This practice leads often to remote subjects.] . . . Nicht alle werden denn an der Besprechung des Einzelnen selbständigen Antheil nehmen können, und ich habe das manchmal als Uebelstand empfunden; doch wird für Erörterung specieller Fragen, der Behandlungsweise überhaupt, der Kritik, der Auffassung, auch der Darstellung, hier immer am ersten und besten Gelegenheit sein: jeder muss eben suchen daraus den möglichsten Vortheil zu ziehen." *Die Historischen Uebungen zu Göttingen. Glückwunschschreiben an Leopold von Ranke zum Tage der Feier seines Fünfzigjährigen Doctorjubiläums, 20 Februar, 1867.*

Whatever may be the worth of the student tradition, there can be no question that the influence of Professor Arndt's seminary on the students who formed it was profound. This fact is attested by the unusually large proportion of dedications to him of doctoral dissertations in all fields of history. See the description of his seminary methods which I gave in a letter to the *Nation*, XLIX, 252-253.

is far less likely to pass over some essential feature of the case because his analysis of his material has been defective. The peculiar training which this method of seminary work ought to give in especial degree is less necessary for the investigator who proposes to do his work in modern history than for the medievalist; that it is really of great importance for him also admits of no question. The habit of questioning one's material sharply for its full meaning with the keen perception of a trained analyzer, whatever sort of material it may be, is of the greatest value; and some modern material, like letters, *ex parte* statements, etc., demands such questioning as much as medieval documents. But analysis is not the sole nor indeed the chief object of this method; the general sharpening of the critical faculty, which is in peculiar degree its result, and the practice which it gives in all sorts of method, make some training in the processes of intensive analysis of value to the worker in every field of history.

In the second class I have intended to group those methods in which, to describe a typical form, some one text, alone or with a closely-related group of texts, is made the basis of a long-continued study, the object being not merely the close scrutiny of the text so used, but also the correction and enlargement of the results obtained from it by evidence drawn from many subsidiary sources. The especial characteristic of this method is less that of internal analysis than in the first class, but is rather that of comparison and combination, the specific object being to determine just what modification, what rejections, corrections, or additions, should be made to the text that is made the foundation of the course by information derived from the other sources. It finds its usual application to narratives covering a considerable period, like chronicles, the reports of an ambassador, a diary, a series of letters, or any similar body of continuous material. In some cases a single text is made to furnish the sole material of study; but such seminaries, if effective, are apt to fall rather into the first class; and, if ineffective, they are apt to degenerate into exercises but little if any better than ordinary college recitations and should then be omitted from consideration. The essential mark of this class should be critical comparison and combination. Seminaries in which specific problems, either unconnected or forming a connected series, proposed by instructor or students or suggested by the literature of the subject, are studied by bringing together and examining the possible sources, and those in which the history of an age or of a historical movement is made the subject of a similar examination belong in this class if the main work of comparison and combination is done in the seminary session, although no one source may be made the cen-

tral core of the study. The object of the work is still to arrive at definite conclusions from a critical comparison of the whole body of materials on which a conclusion must be based, and the method, therefore, does not essentially depart from that of the second main class as I have already described it.

In these seminaries individual assignments are almost unavoidable. If any considerable series of events is to be covered and a rather large mass of material to be brought together in comparison—and both these are presupposed—it is impossible that every student should do all the work, or that all the work be done during the hours of session. A part of the whole is assigned, some time in advance, to each man, who makes as careful preparation as he knows how. This is most often done in one of two ways. In one the student makes for his particular portion or period of the general subject a comparison and analysis of all the material, and presents in his turn the results to the seminary, his report forming the subject of the discussion at one meeting. This presentation is offhand, not in written form. If the reports are made in essay form, that fact so decidedly affects the method of discussion and criticism that a seminary in which it is done must be transferred to the third class, or at least must be considered as a combination of the second and third.<sup>1</sup> The presentation is therefore informal, it is constantly interrupted by questions and criticism, and that portion of the work which is really a scientific process is done in the presence of the seminary, and is to some extent shared in by all. The outside work of the student has spared the seminary the more mechanical parts of the labor and separated the critical portion for study by itself. In the second form each student takes as his especial responsibility one of the sources to be compared for the whole period, examines it critically, prepares himself on its character and history, and on the

<sup>1</sup> By the essay, as the term is used in this article, is not meant the written report on some topic incidental to the progress of the work and called for in its course, as, for example, in the case supposed above, where a member of the seminary might be asked to report, in writing if he chooses, on the writer of one of the sources, his date, biography, character, means of information, etc. It refers rather to the formal statement of the results of an extended special investigation as the method by which the seminary chiefly does its work. Though not contemplated directly as a part of the method itself, constructive work is far more easily attached to this form of seminary than to the first, and not infrequently a seminary is a combination of this method and the third in about equal proportions: *i. e.*, upon an extended preliminary study of the material as described, a series of essays is prepared by the members of the seminary, which then offers material for criticism of constructive work. See the *Beispiele von Anfängerübungen* given by Professor Ernst Bernheim in his *Entwurf eines Studienplans für das Fach der Geschichte und die damit verbundenen Nebenfächer* (Greifswald, 1901).



relation which it bears in general to the other sources, and represents his particular source in the meetings of the seminary. In this method the work of actual comparison, and of reaching a result based on all the sources, is done in the sessions by all the members of the seminary together. Here the essay is impossible, and an important part of each week's work may be regularly expected from each man.

It is, however, in the necessity of individual assignment that the weakness of this method under both forms lies. It is not an uncommon case, particularly in seminaries of the first subdivision, that most of the members of the seminary make no outside preparation except on their portion of the material. In consequence intelligent question and criticism come only from the instructor and from one or two who have taken the pains to study the whole material, and for the majority the exercise is one of observation, not one in which they themselves go through the work. In seminaries of the second subdivision this is equally true of all that portion of the work which goes before the actual comparison, very often the only portion that can be made to involve some of the most important critical training—the determining of the value of the individual text and of the relation in which it ought scientifically to stand to the whole body of material used. The only defense against this weakness is to be found, as in all such cases, in the instructor. If he has the power of inciting an interest in the general subject as it unfolds from week to week, of bringing out clearly every detail of it, and of keeping all at work during the session hour, it may be in great degree overcome. It must be said, however, that the incompetent instructor who finds himself obliged to conduct a seminary course sometimes finds in this method a refuge from his difficulties, and is able to give the appearance of work to what has little of the reality. I have seen seminaries of this type in operation which seemed to me to have practically no value, but it is true that this method is not that most often chosen to conceal, perhaps from oneself, a lack of ability to do the real work for which the seminary is intended. For training in continuous narrative history it is, in my opinion, under a competent instructor the best of the three methods, easily made to cover more completely the necessary points of method than the third, and more naturally to form the basis of constructive work than the first.

In the third class I would put together those forms of the seminary in which the work consists chiefly in the preparation of essays on assigned topics, which are then read to the seminary and subjected to its criticism. Nearly all the seminaries of this class fall into one or the other of two subdivisions: first, those in which each

essay is based on an independent body of source-material, whether the subjects are chosen without reference to one another, like preliminary studies in the preparation of doctor's theses; or are all drawn from the same period, like the Renaissance or the eighteenth century, but each concerned with a separate fragment of the whole; or from some historical movement, like the history of slavery in the United States, but each confined to one of its distinct phases. In the second subdivision are those forms in which a common body of source-material furnishes the subjects of all the essays, whether this material is taken up by each student independently, or, as is more commonly the case, is subjected to a more or less complete preliminary study by the whole seminary before the assignment of individual topics. If this common study is extensive and minute, the seminary may then become a combination of classes two and three, though still essentially belonging to three. But all forms of this group have in common one characteristic, that the scientific processes by which the student reaches his results are not subjected to the criticism of instructor and fellow-students until they are presented to the seminary as a completed whole in a formal essay. The individual does his work of collection, criticism, and combination by himself, and the processes which he has followed in this work are revealed to the seminary only indirectly and by inference in the finished product.<sup>1</sup>

From this fact comes the peculiar difficulty in making this method of seminary instruction equally effective with the other two in the actual training of the scholar, if it is the sole method employed. Everything depends on the character of the criticism to which the essay is subjected when it is presented to the seminary. It is true of course that in every seminary method the most important element of success is the criticism of the individual's suggestions and results which goes on during the seminary session, but here it is peculiarly so as being practically the only means of instruction. If the criticism tears the essay completely to pieces, brings out its methods of collection, comparison, and combination, exposes the faults or merits

<sup>1</sup> Droysen's reasons for preferring the essay method were thus stated by Professor Godefroid Kurth soon after his return to Belgium from a visit to the German universities: essays seem to give more consistency to the student's studies, and to leave a certain permanent result; they furnish more readily the subject of a discussion; they enable one to appreciate more easily the student's power and his scientific ability; and finally they permit his fellow-students to profit more largely by his efforts. See Kurth's article in the *Revue de l'Instruction Publique in Belgique*, N. S., XIX, 93 (1876). Kurth adopted in the main the essay method, and through him it had great influence on seminary instruction in Belgium. See the volume *À Godefroid Kurth* (Liège, n. d., 1898?), dedicated to him by his pupils.

of method in these processes, and of order, perspective, and formulation in the final result, then it is accomplishing fully the work intended. Criticism of this sort, however, is by no means easy and is sometimes not possible. In the first place, it requires from the critic a knowledge of the material on which the essay is based equal, or nearly equal, to that of the writer, and this is provided for, in the case of the student at least, in some forms only of this class. In the second place, it requires the peculiar rhetorical faculty of detecting in the completed essay the processes of construction, and of bringing them out in the criticism in such a way as to make clear the faults of method; and this is a very rare gift, as the history of the English department of any university will probably show.<sup>1</sup> But more important still is the fact that, in America at least, instructors will in most cases hesitate at that sharpness of analysis and criticism which is really necessary if it is to be most useful, and that the student will hardly endure it. We are too thin-skinned a race to enforce or submit to this method in its most effective form. The sort of criticism which goes on sometimes in German seminaries of this class would, I think, be impossible in this country unless in exceptional cases; and, while it would be quite possible to divest the process of some of its European harshness without loss, it would be exceedingly difficult for the American instructor or student to acquire that feeling of impersonalness in the matter which is most essential. Really effective criticism is far more easy in the constant give-and-take natural to the forms of seminary work that are concerned primarily with the process rather than the result. It is then a part of the game to which each in quick turn submits, the instructor like the student if he is really leading the work as he should.

These considerations tend, in my opinion, to the conclusion that where the object is to give the student instruction and practice in the methods of historical criticism, in the correct preparation, analysis, and combination of his material, and thorough discipline of the critical judgment, the essay method is likely to be the least useful and in some cases of no use at all. If the student is to obtain his sole training in seminaries of a single type only, this is the least effective of the three. To this must be added the fact that it is in this form of seminary that the inefficient instructor gets most easily an apparent success. The selection of a series of topics from a mass

<sup>1</sup> In some seminaries of the essay class the attempt is made to overcome the difficulty of getting adequate criticism by requiring each essay to be submitted some time before it is to be read, and committing it in the meantime to some other member of the seminary, who is to study it carefully and prepare a more or less formal criticism of it. This method does not meet all the difficulties, but it is deserving of attention as a helpful expedient.

of material, or from a historical period, is not difficult; the writing of an essay, even without thorough critical training, is soon accomplished, perhaps more easily where thorough critical training is lacking; and a more or less superficial criticism of the result may easily leave on the minds of both instructor and student the impression of a considerable success, while the real work for which the seminary is intended is left undone. The general prevalence of the essay method of work, tending as it has during the last twenty years to supersede all other methods and to become a kind of fashion, ought to occasion, I think, serious thought to all who are interested in maintaining a high standard of university instruction in history. The difficulty of combining with it discipline in the primary processes of investigation and of making it the vehicle of an adequate criticism, together with the ease with which it may lead to an apparent success, should suggest the question whether the efficiency of the seminary is not in danger, whether it is not indeed even now ceasing to some extent to accomplish the results upon which in large part depends the future of historical investigation. It is often said that no other method is possible in a large seminary, but this is, I think, a mistaken opinion. It depends entirely on the instructor, and though in the methods which I have numbered one and two success is not so easy with thirty as with ten, it is by no means impossible, as I can bear witness from personal observation. Increasing numbers are in themselves a danger, however, and I doubt if by any method the seminary can obtain its best results with a membership of more than twenty.

On the other hand, if the student has behind him his training in historical method and has acquired the necessary maturity of critical judgment, so that the process that he follows in the collection of his material no longer needs supervision and criticism, it is also my opinion that this method is the best of all for teaching what needs to be learned and can be taught of historical constructive work, the process of putting together the results already reached by an earlier critical study into a well-proportioned and comprehensive whole. Not much of this faculty can indeed be imparted by instruction. It is in this particular, if in any, that the saying is true that the scholar is born and not made. And yet, if it is possible to keep always in mind the fact that the peculiar usefulness of the essay method is in the field of constructive work, it is a very important part of the scholar's training.

It is my own feeling that if, in the organization of its advanced history work, a university finds itself able to provide a well-led seminary of the first type, and also another of that form of the third in

which a body of material studied in common by way of introduction, and providing a common basis of knowledge for mutual criticism, furnishes topics for essays by all the members of the seminary, it will be in position to offer to its students the seminary advantages which are practically the best possible. In calling attention to the points of strength and weakness of each form of seminary here discussed, it has not been my purpose to criticize any form unfavorably, or to indicate a personal judgment in favor of one rather than another method. There is in my opinion no ideally best method. What is best in each case is a special question to be determined by the particular circumstances and by the preferences and capabilities of the instructor. It has rather been my purpose to point out what needs to be guarded against in each method, or supplemented by combination with another, in order to make its efficiency more nearly perfect. In the conduct of every seminary, of whatever form, there are, I think, three things that should always be striven for: (1) that each student should go through, as nearly as possible, all the work of the seminary himself and through all the processes and steps of historical method; (2) that in each session of the seminary every student, as nearly as possible, should take part in the work, and that no one should be allowed to fall back into the position of an observer; (3) that in all the work of the seminary there should be no let-up of adequate, searching, and severe but kindly criticism. These things seem to me essential to the highest success in any method, and with them any method will accomplish valuable results.

When all has been said, however, we must not overlook the fact that the seminary method is not the only one for the training of historical scholars. The name "seminary" has in itself no talismanic property. My own belief is that if the German universities had developed their higher instruction by a natural process of growth out of something like our early system of college recitations, as we should undoubtedly have done if our higher educational forms had grown up without influence from abroad, the seminary never would have existed as a distinct institution. Precisely the same result would have been accomplished in courses of study not distinguished by name or character from the ordinary work of the university,<sup>1</sup> and the work would have been done with equal efficiency and with less self-consciousness. As it is, we have the seminary, and the result is not to be regretted. But we should recognize the fact that

<sup>1</sup> This is practically what happens in courses in diplomacy and paleography. Many courses in the *École des Chartes*, and those of the London School of Economics and Political Science conducted by Mr. Hubert Hall, to mention only those of which I have some personal knowledge, are really seminary courses whether they bear the name or not, and this must be generally true, I think.

there are at least two other methods by which scholars are trained, perhaps always to be found where seminaries exist in universities worthy of the name, but in many cases the only methods. These may be called the methods of personal example and of private consultation and advice.<sup>1</sup> Probably in the real training of the best historical workers these things have had as much influence as any other, and the cases are by no means few where they have constituted the sole training. If a man is born with the instincts of a scholar, the seed of a living example falls on good ground and brings forth much fruit. Such a man may indeed be carried further by the influence of personal example and by the private advice and direction of an older scholar than by class work alone, indispensable as this is for certain types of mind. If the seminary were on trial for its existence, its defense would be, not that it is the only method of training the scholar, but that it gives the best average result with the student body as a whole. The instructor who is in a position where he can control his human material, and refuse to do his best training work with anything but the best men, will probably be able to produce results more striking and more uniformly of a high order of merit than those who are differently situated.

GEORGE BURTON ADAMS.

<sup>1</sup> The tutorial method of the English universities, so far as it employs original materials, seems not unlike a combination between the essay seminary, though with very small classes if in classes at all, and the method of private guidance. Its success in producing highly trained scholars no one can deny, though to the outsider it seems to be wastefully expensive in its use of the instructor's time.

## THE EARLY LIFE OF OLIVER ELLSWORTH

AMERICANS nowadays display but little fondness for the earlier periods of our national history. Perhaps one reason is that along with our astounding growth in territory and power and wealth there has grown up in us a pride of mere bigness that makes us impatient of the little things it all began with. Another reason may be that we have wandered so far away—and more ways than one—from those ideals which the founders, whenever we turn back to them, seem to be forever holding up to us, not without an effect of warning and reproach. But I think that many of us may also be rendered skittish of Revolutionary history and biography from our distaste for the kind of fervor with which they are commended to us. The zeal displayed in celebrating the founders is too often merely partizan or merely academic or merely antiquarian—or merely feminine. Of late a journalistic impulse has set some rather clever pens to work, revamping our oldest stories, upsetting our most dignified traditions, and disturbing our reverence for our greatest national characters. But this brisk iconoclasm reflects too clearly the commercial motive which is now so dominant in all our journalism to take strong hold of any but a rather shallow class of minds.

In one way or another, however, by partizans or antiquaries, by learned professors or by clever space-writers, by pious descendants or by women's clubs, all but a very few of the leading actors in our earlier scenes have been from time to time sufficiently, if not always quite fittingly, bewritten and belauded. John Marshall's fame is still, it is true, for want of a competent biographer, one of the vaguest of our national possessions; and even of Washington there is not yet a written life of a preëminence comparable with that of his career and character. But I think no other in the whole list of Revolutionists and founders is at present in quite such danger of losing his right place and rank as Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut. Historians apart, and a few lawyers with a historical turn of mind, the chances are that not one in a hundred of his countrymen knows to-day a single fact about him, save that he was once, for a little while, chief justice of our highest court. Two brief accounts of him were published about the middle of the last century, but both belong to series of lives of the chief justices, now but little read.



Yet the truth is that if any one man can be called the founder, not of that court only, but of the whole system of federal courts, which many think the most successful of the three departments of our government, Ellsworth is the man. In the famous Convention which determined the entire framework of the government, he was one of the members whose names should always be associated both with the general character of the Constitution and with important specific clauses. To scholars it is known also, though the evidence is somewhat vaguer, that he had already done good service in the Continental Congress. In the first half-dozen years of Congress under the Constitution, when it was almost constantly engaged in constructive legislation second in importance only to the Convention's, his influence was so great that if any man could be called the leader of the Senate in that period it was he. His, also, was the leading rôle in one of two negotiations with foreign powers on which, even more than on domestic controversies, the safety of the young republic seemed for a long time to depend. For more than a quarter of a century, beginning with the nation's birth, he was, with scarce an interval, engaged with great affairs and in high places. That he was, for a few years, the head of the judiciary, before its work had reached a very high importance—this is by no means his chief title to remembrance. It is, rather, the most factitious of his claims. But if, on the other hand, it is not a mistake to count the founding and the working of governments among the noblest of all mundane enterprises, other and more solid services to his country demand for this colonial lawyer greater honor than has ever been his portion since his life-work was finished—now nearly a century ago.

A word concerning the probable causes of the neglect of Ellsworth may not be amiss. If the accidental plays a part in life and in history, it plays at least an equal part in historiography and biography. Students of the history of literature know well enough how hard it is to secure for the contemporaries of the greatest masters their just award of fame. If Shakespeare had not lived when he did, a dozen poets and dramatists would doubtless be esteemed more highly than they are. In affairs the misfortune of the second-bests is quite as great. The contemporaries of Washington and Hamilton and Jefferson, or of Lincoln and Lee and Grant, lose by obscurity more than they gain in reflected luster. In nearly all his memorable activities Ellsworth was the associate of very famous men. In the Continental Congress he was often detailed for special services with Hamilton and Madison. In the Constitutional Convention none of the younger members could hope to make such a

figure as Washington and Franklin, while the actual lead in the debating fell most naturally to Madison and Randolph and Morris and Wilson. When he became a senator, Ellsworth's real leadership was never clear to his contemporaries, for the debates were secret, and men like Robert Morris and Richard Henry Lee were once again his fellows. As chief justice he followed Rutledge; but Rutledge's service was so short that Ellsworth might as well have had John Jay for his immediate predecessor; and his immediate successor, who held the place a third of a century, was probably the greatest judge in the whole long history of English and American jurisprudence. Turning his hand to diplomacy, Ellsworth made a very important treaty with France. But Jay's treaty with England, negotiated but a few years earlier, had become the target of the opposition in its fiercest attacks; it attained, therefore, by party controversy, a celebrity which neither Ellsworth's nor any other later treaty has ever rivaled. Even in his capacity of Connecticut leader and representative, Ellsworth was again and again the colleague of Roger Sherman, an elder if not a better statesman.

That he belonged to the little colony of Connecticut may also, not unreasonably, be set down as a sort of mishap to his fame. He himself was very far indeed from thinking it a misfortune. "I have visited several countries," he said, when he was growing old, "and I like my own the best. I have been in all the states of the Union, and Connecticut is the best state. Windsor is the pleasantest town in the State of Connecticut, and I have the pleasantest place in the town of Windsor. I am content, perfectly content, to die on the banks of the Connecticut."<sup>1</sup> But it is no controversion of his loyalty to hold that from the banks of the Charles or the Hudson or the Potomac he might have found a shorter path to eminence among his contemporaries and to the reverence of later generations. If he had lived in any one of the bigger colonies, leadership in Congress and Convention would doubtless have been easier to win. A New England worthy, he would have stood a better chance of competent literary celebration if he had belonged to Massachusetts. Americans from all quarters have long been content to learn their country's history from a group of writers who, since their own homes have been in eastern Massachusetts, naturally enough, and with a spirit that ought to be emulated rather than reviled, have guarded from oblivion the great men of their own famous commonwealth. Had Ellsworth been of these, he would doubtless have found a competent biographer among the men of letters of Boston

<sup>1</sup> "An opinion handed down by Oliver Ellsworth", which hangs in a frame beneath his bust in the drawing-room of his home at Windsor.

and Cambridge. But Connecticut, colonized in large part from the slightly older province, has too often been content to accept the place which the people of the Bay Colony assigned her, and to figure in history as a sort of *Hinterland* to Massachusetts. In later years her nearness to the still more populous and wealthy state of New York, and to the greatest of our cities, has affected in much the same way the popular notion of her importance. Referring to this disadvantage of her geographical situation, more than one Connecticut orator has compared the state to Issachar, "a strong ass crouching down between two burdens".<sup>1</sup> To many of us Connecticut still remains, therefore, in history as in geography, a little state between New York and Massachusetts. Ellsworth also remains what at one time, occupying a compromise position, he probably seemed to his contemporaries: an obscure figure of a statesman, between, let us say, John Adams and Alexander Hamilton.

Every day, hurrying in swift railroad trains from New York to Boston or from Boston to New York, hundreds of people thunder across the entire east-and-west extent of the intervening commonwealth. From north to south an ardent pedestrian has walked across it in a single day. Most travelers, passing over it, leave it still unvisited. Yet if one pauses for a closer view, there is much worth seeing in Connecticut. Though the visitor may know already the New York highlands and the Hudson river about West Point, even though he may also know the charm of Massachusetts's landscapes and the rugged splendors of her northern shore, he will wonder why one hears so little of the beautiful valley of the Connecticut.

For any one who cares to look into the history of Connecticut, there are equal surprises. There is in it the very essence of those New England ideals, the fullest exhibition of those New England characteristics, for which we oftener look, instead, to Massachusetts. It was the opinion of Alexander Johnston that Connecticut had so good a government as a colony, and had progressed so far in the experiment of democracy, that when the time came for our greater national experiment she presented the best of all the object-lessons which the founders had before them.<sup>2</sup> He held, accordingly, that to

<sup>1</sup> Colonel Wadsworth, in proceedings of Connecticut assembly, reported in *American Museum*, October, 1787, 398. Ellsworth, January 4, 1788, in convention to ratify the Constitution. Elliot, *Debates*, II, 186.

<sup>2</sup> Alexander Johnston, *Connecticut*, preface, viii, ix, and pp. 322-326. But in this REVIEW (IX, 480, note) Professor Max Farrand has pointed out that the evidence is wanting to prove that the Constitutional Convention of 1787 ever did take the Connecticut system as a model in any portion of its work. Johnston's contention that Connecticut afforded also an example of the successful working of the federal principle is, I suppose, no longer accepted by students of colonial history.

the general scheme of our government no other state contributed so much of what was new, of what was American. Such a claim, from such a source, is enough to arrest one's attention, even though the various chronicle of Massachusetts distract from one side, while on the other side there bulks the central importance of the greatest of our states and cities.

The ancient town of Windsor, a few miles north of Hartford, is at the center of Connecticut's most charming stretch of country. It is the center also of much of what is best and strongest in the traditions of the little commonwealth. "Ancient Windsor" now, the place was at least Old Windsor to the generation that fought the War of Independence. Along its main street, which follows for some miles a slight ridge or sand-bank parallel to the broad and straight Connecticut river, scores of colossal elms, and an extraordinary number of good colonial houses behind them, bear witness to its age. It was, in fact, one of the three towns with which Connecticut history began; and throughout the colonial period, the Revolution, and the early years of independence, it contributed to the service of the colony and the state a long list of honorable names. They are, with very few exceptions, names that clearly reveal the source of the first immigration in the great middle class of English society. The only perceptible admixtures are Scotch, or Scotch-Irish, and Huguenot French. On the gravestones of the old Windsor burial-ground one finds the epitaphs of generation after generation of Allens and Allyn's, Bissells, Browns, Cookes, Drakes, Edwardses, Eggles-ton's, Ellsworths, Enos, Filleys, Fitches, Gaylords (originally Gaillard and French), Gilletts (originally Gillette and also French), Grants, Griswolds, Haydens, Loomises, Mathers, Newberrys, Phelps's, Pinneys, Rockwells, Sills, Stilese's, Stoughtons, Thralls, and Wolcotts. The same names have appeared and reappeared at frequent intervals for two centuries and a half in the public records of the town, the colony, the state. Several have risen, on the wider field of the national service, to very high distinction. Generals and judges and admirals, inventors and men of letters, leaders in great business enterprises, congressmen and senators, and at least one President, have traced their descent from the men who came to Windsor when the country all about it was a wilderness. The two Windsor names which emerged into the clearest light between the settlement and the Revolution were those of Edwards and Wolcott. In that part of the town which lay to the eastward of "the great river", Jonathan Edwards was born; and for a hundred and fifty years there was scarcely a single Windsor generation that did not look to a Wolcott as the foremost citizen.

The first of the Ellsworths came about the middle of the seventeenth century. Whence he came is not precisely known; the best-derived conjecture is, from Yorkshire, where the name is still quite common.<sup>1</sup> Neither is it known precisely when he came, but the town records show that in November, 1654, he was married to Elizabeth Holcomb, and that, the same year, he bought a home in that part of Windsor which lay to the south of "the little river", as the Farmington was called, and to the west of "the great river". Ten years later, however, he moved across the little river to North Windsor and made his home on a plot of land which for two hundred and thirty-nine years remained in the hands of his descendants. From the town and church records we learn further that he was made a freeman in 1657, a juror in 1664, that in 1676 he gave three shillings for the relief of the poor of other colonies, and that when he died his estate was valued at £655—which, for the times and the country, was no mean sum. A curious list of taxpayers,<sup>2</sup> made in 1675, shows that for substance he ranked among the first of his contemporaries. There were five classes in all, and the highest class, each of whom possessed "a family, a horse [and] four oxen", numbered but twenty-nine. Ellsworth was of these. His gravestone adds to these proofs of his good standing a military title somewhat more distinguished in the seventeenth century than it is in the twentieth. The inscription reads: "Sargient Iosiah Elsworth Aged 60 years He dyed August the 20th Day; Ano. 1689."<sup>3</sup>

Nine children were born to him, and the graves of his descendants are clustered thick about his own. Many of these are marked with gravestones, bearing each a title or a pithy record of some good work done, or at least some honorable place held, in the little community. The sixth child and third son of the immigrant is designated on his gravestone simply as "Mr. Jonathan Elsworth";<sup>4</sup> but it is otherwise known of him that he was born in 1669, that he died in 1749, that he was a successful storekeeper and tavern-keeper, a

<sup>1</sup> Henry R. Stiles, *The History and Genealogies of Ancient Windsor* (Hartford, 2 vols., 1891-1892), II, 208-210; manuscript notes by Mr. W. Irving Vinal; two manuscript lives of Oliver Ellsworth, one by Joseph Wood, Ellsworth's son-in-law, the other by Reverend Abner Jackson, president of Hobart College, who married a granddaughter of Ellsworth.

<sup>2</sup> Stiles, *Ancient Windsor*, I, 88.

<sup>3</sup> The first name is sometimes given as Josias. For most of these facts, see *ibid.*, II, 210.

<sup>4</sup> But in the family Bible of Chief-Justice Ellsworth his name is given as David. This is puzzling, for all the other records name him Jonathan. The best conjecture I can make by way of explanation is that by a slip of the pen the chief justice wrote his father's name for his grandfather's—a strange mistake to make, it must be admitted, and a stranger still not to have corrected.

man of good sense, including a sense of humor, and that in person he was tall and strong. His wife was a Grant.<sup>1</sup> Their seventh child and fourth son, born in 1709, was christened David, and it is "Capt. David Ellsworth" (this time with two l's) on his gravestone. The title was not an empty one, for he served in the War of the Spanish Succession, known in America as the Old French War, and in 1745 commanded a company from Windsor at the famous siege of Louisbourg. Returning in safety from that expedition, which was by no means a holiday affair, he lived to the eve of the recognition of the colonies' independence, and nearly all his life he was selectman of his native town. Inheriting a hundred pounds, he had the industry and the shrewdness to accumulate a considerable estate, and to win the reputation of being an excellent farmer. A grandson has recorded that "He had much cunning, or quick wit, and very sound judgment".<sup>2</sup> His wife, who was Jemima Leavitt, of the neighboring village of Suffield, is somewhat formidably described as "a lady of excellent mind, good character, and pious principles". Surviving him, she was married again, at the age of sixty-two, to a wealthy citizen of East Windsor.<sup>3</sup>

The highest and stateliest of all the monuments in the Ellsworth family group, rising up from the rear of the pleasant little burial-ground behind the old First Church, and overlooking the little river, marks the grave of Oliver, the second son and second child of Captain David and his wife Jemima. He was born on the twenty-ninth of April, 1745, and belongs, therefore, to the generation that came to its prime about the beginning of the War of Independence.

It is necessary to be brief with his childhood and boyhood, for little or nothing is known of his life in this early period. A farmer's boy in a provincial country town, he was doubtless accustomed to frugal fare, simple amusements, and hard, wholesome tasks. Beyond question he was from his childhood made familiar with the doctrine and observance of the Congregational church, the established church of the colony. Since Connecticut from a very early period had maintained an excellent school system, supported by taxation, and since Windsor was an old town of considerable wealth, we are also reasonably sure that his early schooling was as good as could be had anywhere in the colonies. But what sort of pupil he was, or indeed what sort of boy he was, we do not know. One fact, how-

<sup>1</sup> Stiles, *Ancient Windsor*, II, 210-211; manuscript notes in the collection of Mr. W. Irving Vinal.

<sup>2</sup> Manuscript of Oliver Ellsworth, Jr., a son of the chief justice, quoted in Stiles, *Ancient Windsor*, II, 212.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

ever, may be taken to indicate that he was thought a boy of promise. His father early set about to prepare him for the ministry; and in colonial New England the ministry ranked so high among the professions that only a boy of promise would be brought up to aspire to it. With that career in view, he was sent to the Reverend Dr. Joseph Bellamy, of Bethlehem, a friend of Jonathan Edwards, famous as a preacher throughout New England, and known by his writings even in England and Scotland. Dr. Bellamy prepared him for college, and in 1762, at the age of seventeen, he entered Yale.

But it was twenty-nine years before he got a Yale degree, and then it came to him, not as in course, but *honoris causa*. He remained at New Haven only to the end of his sophomore year, and there is reason to believe that either he or the authorities of the college, and not improbably both, would have been better pleased to close the connection even sooner. He entered, it seems, at a time of undergraduate discontents such as all colleges now and then have to weather. The long administration of President Thomas Clap was drawing to a close; and his headship of the still struggling seminary, though admirable for vigor and devotion, had been growing too arbitrary to please the student body. There was much complaint also of the tutors; and it is hardly necessary to add that the students held the immemorial undergraduate conviction concerning the food which was served to them in the college commons, and that they did not forbear, when occasion offered, to make their disapproval known. It must be confessed that even a moderate epicure could have found a trifle to criticize, now and then, in the college fare. According to a set of regulations in force about this time, breakfast for four was one loaf of bread. Dinner was more substantial; but supper, also for four, was an apple-pie and one quart of beer.<sup>1</sup> If young Ellsworth had made a request forever associated with his Christian name, he would doubtless have won distinction earlier than he did.

The intellectual fare was, it would seem, neither more abundant nor more tempting. At Yale, as indeed at all the colonial colleges, the curriculum was a hard and fast and uniform programme. "In the first Year", so the laws<sup>2</sup> read, "They Shall principally Study the Tongues and Logic, and Shall in Some measure pursue the Study of the Tongues the Two next Years. In the Second Year They Shall Recite Rhetoric, Geometry and Geography. In the Third Year Natural Philosophy, Astronomy and Other Parts of the Mathe-

<sup>1</sup> Franklin B. Dexter, *Yale Biographies and Annals*, 2d series, 141; Daniel Butler on the Yale Commons, *Yale College* (edited by William L. Kingsley, 2 vols., New York, 1879), I, 297-306.

<sup>2</sup> Laws of Yale College, 1745, printed in Dexter, *Yale Biographies and Annals*, 2d series, 5.



matics. In the Fourth Year Metaphysics and Ethics . . . but every Saturday Shall Especially be allotted to the Study of Divinity." It was useless to ask for more, or for any variation in the programme. The teaching force was too small to give well even what was offered. Each of the two or three tutors was responsible for all the instruction, in all branches, that was given to the class or section under his especial care.

The year before Ellsworth entered, there had been so much disorder that a petition, prepared, no doubt, by enemies of President Clap, had been presented to the general assembly of the colony, asking an investigation. "There has been a tumult," a trustee wrote, "the Desk pulled down, the Bell-case broken, and the bell ringing in the night, Mr. Boardman the tutor beaten with clubbs"<sup>1</sup>—which was clearly contrary to rule, for penal law number 19 expressly provided: "If any Scholar Shall make an assault upon the Person of the President or either of the Tutors or Shall wound, Bruise or Strike any of Them, He Shall forthwith be Expelled."<sup>2</sup> Similar disorders arose from time to time until, in 1765–1766, the climax came in a practically unanimous signed petition of the students for the removal of President Clap. During the last term of that year not more than two-thirds of the student body was in attendance. It is not surprising, when one remembers that this was the time of the struggle over the Stamp Act, to find the state of affairs in the college attributed to the spirit of resistance to arbitrary rule which was rising throughout the colonies. General Gage, at Boston, referred to Yale in 1765 as a "seminary of democracy".<sup>3</sup> Young Roswell Grant, of the class of 1765, wrote home to his father at Windsor that he would be very glad of a cheese, but added: "Shall not want that Cherry [sherry] you Reserved for me before vacancy, as all the Scholars have unanimously agreed not to Drink any foreign spirituous Liquors any more."<sup>4</sup> It is clear that undergraduate Yale was at least as patriotic as it was rebellious.

Ellsworth's share in these activities, patriotic and rebellious, cannot now be ascertained. He appears, however, in at least two cases of discipline on the records of the faculty.<sup>5</sup> His prime offense in the first case, in July, 1763, was the puzzling misdemeanor of joining with ten others, in the evening, "to scrape and clean the college yard"; but a second count arraigned him and his comrades for

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, 682.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 3d series, 170.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 94.

<sup>5</sup> Transcripts from the faculty records, which were kindly made for me by Professor F. B. Dexter.

"having a treat or entertainment last winter"; and still a third count set forth that he and three others "presently after evening Prayers on Thursday last put on their Hats and run and Hallooed in the College Yard in contempt of the Law of College". For these offenses he was fined one shilling. The second case arose the next year, and the charge was that Ellsworth was present "at Bulkley 2<sup>s</sup>", at "a general treat or comotation of wine both common and spiced in and by the sophomore class", and the punishment was a fine of four shillings. There were degrees of guilt, for two ringleaders were fined five shillings, Ellsworth and two others four shillings, while the majority of the offenders were let off at two shillings. These performances do not strike one as very damning. They do, however, seem to prove that Ellsworth was once a boy, and that the boys of colonial New England were not entirely unlike their descendants—at least, when they went to college. Perhaps they indicate also that Ellsworth was already out of sympathy with his father's ambition that he should be a minister.

Why he left Yale is not quite clear. President Clap entered in his official journal, under the date July 27, 1764, that "Oliver Ellsworth and Waightstill Avery, at the desire of their respective parents, were dismissed from being members of this College".<sup>1</sup> But among the descendants of Ellsworth at least two other stories are told to account for his departure from New Haven. One is, that at midnight in midwinter he inverted the college bell and filled it with water, which promptly froze.<sup>2</sup> But this explanation hardly consists with the date of his dismissal. Unfortunately for the other story, it has been told of more than one celebrity, and of other colleges than Yale. It is that Ellsworth was caught by a college officer giving in his room what in his day was called a "treat" but in the college nomenclature of the present day would be called a "spread"; and that the officer, about to enter and disperse the company, was stopped by hearing Ellsworth's voice uplifted in prayer—for there was a college law that no student should be interrupted at his devotions.<sup>3</sup> Of this story there is a second version which, even if it were never told of any one but Ellsworth, sounds too modern for belief. It is that the officer was making a round of the dormitory in search of signs which the students had stolen from New Haven tradesmen, and that the words of the prayer he heard were the words of Matthew XII, 39.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Entry copied in a letter from Professor F. B. Dexter.

<sup>2</sup> Henry Cabot Lodge, oration on Ellsworth, in *A Fighting Frigate and other Essays and Addresses* (New York, 1902), 70, note.

<sup>3</sup> Letter from Mrs. Alice L. Wyckoff, of Buffalo, N. Y.

<sup>4</sup> Letter from Mrs. Geneve (Ellsworth) Stuart, a great-granddaughter of Ellsworth.

For Ellsworth's career at Princeton, tradition is almost the only source of information; the written records of the immediate government of the College of New Jersey in colonial times are not preserved.<sup>1</sup> Younger than either Yale or Harvard, Princeton was also smaller; there can hardly have been a hundred students when Ellsworth entered. Age and size apart, it differed from the other two mainly by the strong infusion of Calvinism in its theology and of Scotch and Scotch-Irish blood in its membership. John Witherspoon had not yet consented to come over from Scotland and head the institution, but President Samuel Finley (1761-1766) was a Scotch-Irish Presbyterian minister with a great reputation in the middle colonies and Virginia.

In respect of the curriculum and the number of teachers, Princeton offered to young Ellsworth no more than Yale had offered; but it was apparently rather more fortunate in its tutors, and in the spirit that informed both the teachers and the taught. The arts of speaking and writing, in particular, appear to have been taught uncommonly well and studied with extraordinary enthusiasm. It is certain that of all the colonial colleges, Harvard and William and Mary not excepted, no other was at this time training so many debaters for the Continental Congress and the still undreamed-of Constitutional Convention.<sup>2</sup> Waightstill Avery, Ellsworth's companion in migration, had before him a good career in public life in North Carolina. In the class which they joined, numbering but thirty-one, and a large class for Princeton, were Luther Martin of Maryland, and at least three others with parts to play in the coming political changes. William Paterson, graduated the year before, was living in the village and in constant association with his younger mates. Benjamin Rush, John Henry, Tapping Reeve, Hugh Henry Brackenridge, Philip Freneau, Henry Lee, Pierrepont Edwards, Gunning Bedford, James Madison, and Aaron Burr were all in classes close before or after Ellsworth's class of 1766. Of those students who were not, as the event proved, in training for statesmanship, fully half were preparing for the ministry. It is no wonder that courses in oratory and composition were popular, or that the Stamp Act controversy aroused at Princeton even more discussion than at Yale.

<sup>1</sup> For Princeton at this time see John Maclean, *History of the College of New Jersey* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1877); John De Witt and Jesse Lynch Williams, "Princeton", in *Universities and their Sons*, I, 439-568; Gaillard Hunt, *The Life of James Madison* (New York, 1902), chap. ii; Woodrow Wilson and John De Witt in *Memorial Book of the Sesquicentennial Celebration of Princeton University* (New York, 1898), 102-131, 315 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Woodrow Wilson, *ibid.*, 110-114.

Tradition and reminiscence indicate that Ellsworth entered with zest into the somewhat fervid life of his new academic home. A respectable scholar, he was, we are told, remarkably successful in college politics, displaying an uncommon shrewdness, a gift of management, and a talent for debate<sup>1</sup>. The best-known story of his Princeton days is of how he circumvented a rule forbidding students to wear their hats in the college yard. Arraigned for breaking the rule, he pointed out that a hat, to be a hat, must consist of a crown and a brim, and proved that the head-piece he had worn in the yard was without a brim—as he had in fact torn off that essential portion of it. A better authenticated and more important tradition indicates clearly enough what the young fellow's tastes and powers were. There seems to be little doubt that he was one of the founders of the Well-Meaning Club, a debating-society, which was suppressed in 1768 but later revived and reorganized as the Cliosopfic Society, and is now better known to Princeton men as Clio. Another club, formed about the same time, first called the Plain-Dealing Club, and likewise suppressed in 1768, was reorganized by Madison,<sup>2</sup> John Henry, and Samuel Stanhope Smith, and named the American Whig Society. Among the college debating-clubs throughout the country, these two Princeton societies hold the first rank for age, for celebrity, and for the names on their rolls of membership. It seems most likely that Paterson, who was fond of such activities, and precisely the sort of man to lead in them, was the moving spirit when Clio was founded; but with his name tradition has firmly associated those of Ellsworth, Luther Martin, and Tapping Reeve.<sup>3</sup> There is scarcely to be found, even in the records of the Oxford Union, a coincidence more curiously prophetic. We are told, also, that both these clubs were mightily concerned about the Stamp Act and the relations of the colonies to the mother-country. It is true that New Jersey and the other central colonies had less leadership in the Revolutionary movement than New England or Virginia; but Princeton already drew her students from surprising distances. The acquaintances Ellsworth made there, and the outlook he gained, were doubtless a better introduction to the whole field of colonial politics than he could have got at any other college. Perhaps they helped him to form the

<sup>1</sup> Wood and Jackson manuscripts.

<sup>2</sup> Hunt, *Madison*, 15; De Witt and Williams, in *Universities and their Sons*, I, 482-484; Maclean, *College of New Jersey*, I, 364.

<sup>3</sup> John Addison Porter, "College Fraternities", in *Century Magazine*, September, 1888, 751. For Paterson, see W. Jay Mills, *Glimpses of Colonial Society and the Life at Princeton College, 1766-1773* (Philadelphia, 1903), made up chiefly of Paterson's letters. The corresponding secretary of the Cliosopfic Society states that there is no record of Ellsworth's connection with it now in the society's possession.

habit of caution and to develop the instinct for compromise which were, later, conspicuous characteristics. At any rate, he had got what few but the wealthiest young colonials could have—an education a long way from home.

When, however, he went back to Connecticut, his father had not relinquished the plan of making him a minister. He accordingly spent the next year in the study of theology under Dr. John Smalley, of New Britain, a young clergyman of parts, who rose to influence and distinction.<sup>1</sup> But Ellsworth had by this time a clear bent toward the law. When Dr. Smalley directed him to prepare his first sermon, the first ten sheets of his manuscript were given over to careful definition of his terms.<sup>2</sup> His teacher and his father were at length persuaded that his mind and tastes were better suited to the bar than to the pulpit.

It was four years, however, before he was admitted to the bar; and for those four years, from 1767 to 1771, the record of his life is very scant. He studied law under the first Governor Griswold and under Jesse Root, of Coventry, a young attorney with whom he was later associated in the Continental Congress, and whose name appears many times in the public records of Connecticut. But Ellsworth can hardly have given the whole of the four years to his studies. In one account of his life it is stated that he taught school for a little while<sup>3</sup>—an experience curiously common in the lives of eminent Americans. When he began practice as a lawyer, he was in debt, and a natural inference is that after he abandoned theology his father made no further expenditures for his education.

In any case, however, his education in the law could not have been elaborate. There were no law-schools in the colonies. The people of Connecticut were thought to be peculiarly and perversely litigious, but the *Commentaries* of Blackstone were still unknown among them. The first American edition of the work was printed in 1771 or 1772, and a copy with Ellsworth's name and the date 1774 on the fly-leaf is still in existence<sup>4</sup>; one conjectures that he never possessed the book, probably never even saw it, until he had been several years in practice. His text-books were Matthew Bacon's *Abridgment of the Law* and Giles Jacob's *Law-Dictionary*.<sup>5</sup> In fact,

<sup>1</sup> James Hammond Trumbull, *The Memorial History of Hartford County* (2 vols., Boston, 1886), II, 309-310.

<sup>2</sup> *Centennial Papers of the General Conference of the Congregational Churches of Connecticut* (Hartford, 1877), 107-108.

<sup>3</sup> James B. Longacre and James Herring, *National Portrait Gallery*, IV (Philadelphia, 1839), article on Ellsworth, 2 (102).

<sup>4</sup> W[illiam] B[liss], "Chief-Justice Ellsworth and his Times", in *New York Evening Post*, April 9, 1875.

<sup>5</sup> Henry Flanders, *The Lives and Times of the Chief Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States* (2 vols., Philadelphia, 1855-1858), II, 59.

there were no text-books, properly so called. It may be added that until very near the time when he began to practice there was considerable opposition to the common law in Connecticut.<sup>1</sup> The colony had begun its legislative history with what looks like a complete disavowal and rejection of the system. It was never adopted by a statute, but came in gradually by a change of usage on the bench and at the bar, as professionally trained practitioners became more numerous. Even when the decisions of the English judges were familiarly cited in the Connecticut courts, the means of studying them were scant and crude. Good law-libraries were extremely rare, and the labors of the colonial lawyer were not made easy by treatises and digests. It is altogether improbable that Ellsworth possessed, at the outset of his professional career, any such store of facts or principles as would now be required of him in an examination for admission to the bar of any New England state. Yet the way he did learn the law was not unlike the method of studying and teaching it which has come of late into very wide acceptance. He mastered it only by searching out and storing in his mind the principles at the heart of particular cases. In that process is involved the essence of the modern "case-system"; and it is doubtful if a better training for the reason has ever been devised.

But the opportunity to learn law even in this way was for a time withheld. Cases to study and to try were not immediately forthcoming. Ellsworth had first to undergo a discipline in patience and frugality which seems to have been severe enough to make his professional career in all respects representative. Somebody has said that poverty and an early marriage make the best beginning of a lawyer's life; and both were in his portion. To pay the debts incurred while he was preparing for the bar he had but one resource—a tract of woodland on the Connecticut which had come to him by inheritance or gift.<sup>2</sup> He tried in vain to sell the land, and then, shouldering an ax, attacked the timber, for which there was a market at Hartford. In this way he cleared himself of his debt. But for three years after his admission to the bar his professional earnings, by his own account, were but three pounds, Connecticut currency. And yet, in 1772, a year after his admission, he was married.

His bride was Abigail, the daughter of Mr. William Wolcott, of East Windsor, a gentleman of substance and distinction, and a member of that same Wolcott family which had held so high a place

<sup>1</sup> Ephraim Kirby, *Reports of Cases Adjudged in the Superior Court of the State of Connecticut, 1785-1788* (Litchfield, 1789), preface, iii; Wood MS.; Dwight Loomis and J. Gilbert Calhoun, *Judicial and Civil History of Connecticut* (Boston, 1895), 176-177; *Analectic Magazine*, III (1814), 385.

<sup>2</sup> Wood MS.; Flanders, II, 59-60.

in the community from the very beginning. The tradition is that when Ellsworth made his first visit at the Wolcott house, he called for an elder sister, but that the black eyes of Abigail, who sat demurely carding tow in the chimney-corner, made him change his mind, and the next time he went there he called for her.<sup>1</sup> A portrait of her, painted when she was in middle life, suggests rather the good and cheerful housewife than the sort of colonial beauty whom Colonial Dames are now so fond of celebrating. One or two anecdotes, however, present her to posterity as an uncommonly loving and lovable woman. She was given to charity, and her life abounded in kindness to all about her. That a briefless young lawyer could win, apparently without objection from her family, the daughter of so respectable a house is evidence of the wholesome democracy in which they lived. It is evidence, too, of the simplicity and strength of their affection for each other. That, happily, was strong enough to last them through their lives. The biographer of Ellsworth is often tempted to complain of the scarcity of purely personal details; but he is happily spared the temptation to stir the interest of his readers with any parade of family skeletons. In all that pertained to his family and his home, Ellsworth was both wise and fortunate.

The two began life on a farm which belonged to Ellsworth's father, and which the son now took over to cultivate, either, it seems, on shares, or on a lease for rent.<sup>2</sup> It lay in the northwest part of old Windsor, which was then called Wintonbury, and is now called Bloomfield. The land was unfenced, and Ellsworth with his own hands cut and split the rails and built a fence about it. Too poor to hire a servant, he did himself all the heavier household chores, and twice a day when court was in session he walked the ten miles between his home and his office in Hartford. Once, when a wealthier neighbor passed him in a carriage and told him that a man in his position ought to be riding and not walking, Ellsworth cheerfully replied that everybody must walk some time or other in his life, and that he for his part preferred to do his walking while he was young and strong. Of course we are also told, for a climax to the story, that a time came later when Ellsworth kept a carriage and his neighbor had to walk.<sup>3</sup>

The farm must have been the young man's main support during the year or two longer that he had to wait for his first important case. He became an intelligent and zealous farmer; that is more than conjecture. But neither this nor his study of the law can be

<sup>1</sup> Jabez H. Hayden, in *Memorial History of Hartford County*, II, 565.

<sup>2</sup> Wood MS.; Flanders, II, 61.

<sup>3</sup> Wood MS.; Stiles, *Ancient Windsor*, II, 218; Flanders, II, 62.



reckoned his principal achievement between his college days and that success which was soon to be his portion. Scanty as the record of those years is, we know that they covered a very fine and admirable discovery and development of his powers, for when Ellsworth first came fully into the light his character was rounded and hardened into the best type of colonial New England manhood. In later life, he himself, being asked for the secret of his effectiveness, told modestly and convincingly the story of his growth.<sup>1</sup> Early in his career, he said, he made the discouraging discovery that he had no imagination, nor any other brilliant quality of mind. Determined, however, to make the most of such powers as he had, he resolved to study but one subject at a time, and to stick to it until he mastered it. In the practice of his profession, he added, his rule was to go at once to the main points of a case and to give them his entire attention.

In this candid self-examination, this honest acceptance of his limitations, this manly and courageous decision, one finds enough to command one's hearty respect. But it is not to be supposed that by this self-study and this plan of life alone the reasonably mischievous and reckless youngster of Yale and Princeton was at once transformed into a cautious and hard-headed but uncommonly upright lawyer and statesman. None of Ellsworth's New England contemporaries was more thoroughly representative than he was of New England civilization at its best; and colonial New England was already—Switzerland, perhaps, excepted—the soundest democracy in the world. Nowhere else was liberty restrained by such strong reverences, or safeguarded by so practical an instinct, or fortified with a morality so wide-spread and so thoroughgoing. New England society, even in its unspoiled colonial state, had its faults, and some of its faults were hateful. The bit of talk about himself which I have just given is, for instance, almost the only frank and ingenuous revelation of his nature to be found in all that Ellsworth ever wrote and spoke. When he became a man of substance, it was said that he took the utmost pains to conceal from his own household the extent of his wealth. Secretiveness and unresponsiveness were bound to be common among a people who cultivated, almost to excess, the fine qualities of self-reliance and forethought. We shall never be acquainted with Ellsworth or any other colonial New-Englander as we are with famous Americans from other quarters, and with famous Englishmen as well. Wanting, as a rule, in amiability and quick sympathy, the colonial Yankee had also more positive faults. Pecksniffs as well as Dombey's there were no doubt

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, 64-65.

among them. Where all were so free to live their individual lives according to their own ideals, some were surely selfish as well as self-contained. Where so large a number were religious, some were doubtless sanctimonious and hypocritical.

But if we judge them in the mass, it is hard to match them for competency in the management of their own affairs, whether as individuals or in bodies politic, or for fidelity to their difficult ideals. By Ellsworth's time, the Puritan theology was already relaxed into a fairly livable creed. Before he died, the Unitarian movement was already begun in Massachusetts. A general broadening of ideas and sympathies accompanied the religious change. Sloughing off the worst defects of its quality, New England society displayed during the first half of the nineteenth century a spectacle of intelligence, of energy, and of general healthfulness and soundness which has probably never been surpassed.

Ellsworth, whatever slight vagaries he had exhibited in his boyhood, took into his nature and kept throughout his life the best characteristics of his kind. He came to his fine opportunities a completely grown-up man, a quick but ready man, thoughtful and deeply religious, but also ardent, industrious, practical, and shrewd. For the rest, he had got from his ancestors and his healthful country life a superb endowment of physical strength and hardiness. According to the family tradition, his height was six feet two, and he was broad-shouldered and robust. His countenance was not positively handsome. If we may judge from his portraits, until age and suffering had softened it, there was neither sweetness nor distinction in his face; but he had the strong jaws, the long chin, the firm lips, the steady eyes which always indicate the man of purpose and persistency. But to an unimaginative man, with little or nothing of the artist or the actor in his nature, a body and presence such as Ellsworth's was of far less advantage before the public than it might have been had his temperament been different. He used and valued his bodily endowment for hard work rather than for display. The interest of his life is not to be found in dramatic exhibitions of any sort. It lies, rather, in the tasks which his hand found to do—tasks whose value and importance we cannot even yet feel sure that we have measured. He brought to his life-work talents which cannot be called extraordinary in themselves; but he plied them with abundant energy, he ruled them with strong will, he devoted them always to high purposes; and he made them serve.

The beginning of his rise to eminence was professional success; and this, when it did come, seems to have come both swiftly and abundantly. According to his early biographers, a single case, in-

volution an important legal principle, proved to be the sort of opportunity that leads to countless others. The young lawyer managed it so skilfully that he not only secured a verdict for his client but won for himself the respect and confidence of his neighbors.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps it was also on this occasion that he heard from the lips of a stranger what he afterward declared were the first words of encouragement that ever heartened him in his ambition. "Who is that young man?", the stranger was saying. "He speaks well."<sup>2</sup>

At any rate, from about the third year of his membership of the bar his practice grew very fast, and he rose quite as fast in the esteem of his neighbors. At the autumn session of the general assembly in 1773, he took his seat as one of the two deputies from Windsor, and his name appears in every list of the deputies thereafter until May of the year 1775.<sup>3</sup> That year, the year of his thirtieth birthday, was doubtless to him, as to many another young colonial, the *annus mirabilis* of his whole career. Tradition has fixed upon it as the date of his removal to Hartford from the Wintonbury farm<sup>4</sup>. It saw him also engaged in the first of those Revolutionary tasks which were to claim him continuously until the end of the struggle for independence. From that year to the end of the century, in fact, he was scarcely for an instant free from important public responsibilities. But he did not relinquish his profession. Throughout the Revolution, and until the new national government was organized under the Constitution, he was always either actively in practice or else on the bench. It was as a lawyer that he won his fortune and a good part of his fame. It will be best, therefore, before we follow him into the service of his country, to seek some notion of the sort of man he was in the common, daily struggle, and more particularly to learn what we can of his character and figure at the bar.

For this inquiry, few records are available, and these are of little use. In the courts where Ellsworth practiced, the stenographer was

<sup>1</sup> George Van Santvoord, *Sketches of the Lives and Judicial Services of the Chief-Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States* (New York, 1854), 196; Wood and Jackson MSS.

<sup>2</sup> *National Portrait Gallery*, IV, 103 (Ellsworth, 3); Flanders, II, 63.

<sup>3</sup> *Roll of State Officers and General Assembly of Connecticut* (Hartford, 1881), *passim*; *The Public Records of the Colony of Connecticut, 1636-1776* (compiled by James Hammond Trumbull and Charles J. Hoadly, 15 vols., 1850-1890), XIV, 159, 214, 252, 325, 388, 413. All the biographers of Ellsworth have been extremely loose in their statements concerning the offices he held in the earlier part of his career. Where dates are given, they are nearly always incorrect. Perhaps the official records were not accessible when these accounts were written. It is hardly worth while to specify their inaccuracies. Not one of them gives the impression that he was in the assembly as early as 1773.

<sup>4</sup> In May, 1774, Ellsworth's name first appears in the list of justices of the peace for Hartford county. *Colonial Records*, XIV, 257, XV, 8.

of course unknown; nor did daily newspapers spread before their readers detailed narratives of his causes. Compared with our present usage, the reporting of that day, both official and unofficial, was bafflingly meager. Moreover, Ellsworth himself, though by no means slow of speech, was curiously averse to the pen.<sup>1</sup> There can scarcely be another man of comparable importance in our history who has left behind him so few papers of any sort in his own handwriting. Not one of his court speeches is preserved to us. It is quite probable that none was ever written out. Even his briefs are said to have been exceptionally condensed, setting forth only the principal headings of his arguments.

Fortunately, however, a number of his contemporaries have left us their impressions of Ellsworth as an advocate; and of those contemporaries several were themselves of an eminence to give their judgments weight. One, at least, is better known to-day than Ellsworth is; his name, indeed, is quite probably familiar to more English-speaking people than any other American name but Washington's. In 1779, young Noah Webster was a student in Ellsworth's office and an inmate of his home. Many years later, Webster's eldest daughter was married to one of Ellsworth's sons.<sup>2</sup> This personal association may perhaps have heightened the lexicographer's opinion of the statesman's importance, for Webster was given to dilating on all things in any way related to his own career. But he was also trained to state facts carefully; and to Joseph Wood, Ellsworth's son-in-law and biographer, he once declared that Ellsworth, even at the time when Webster was in his office, had usually on his docket from a thousand to fifteen hundred cases.<sup>3</sup> In fact, Webster added, there was scarcely a case tried in which Ellsworth was not of counsel on one side or the other, and his mind was under a constant strain throughout the sessions. Sometimes, from sheer physical weariness, he would gird his loins with a handkerchief as he rose for an argument in some new case. Perhaps the number of his cases is partly explained by the statement that he excelled in *nisi prius*

<sup>1</sup> "This same Ellsworth is a striking instance how powerful a man may be in some departments of the mind and defective in others. All-powerful and eloquent in debate, he is, notwithstanding, a miserable draftsman." *Journal of William Maclay* (edited by Edgar S. Maclay, New York, 1890), 369. But Wood, Ellsworth's son-in-law, attributes to caution his aversion to writing. He had, according to Wood, a settled conviction that it is dangerous and mischievous for public men to use the pen freely, and he accordingly made it a rule "to make all his manuscripts as brief as possible". Wood MS.

<sup>2</sup> Horace E. Scudder, *Noah Webster*, in *American Men of Letters Series* (Boston, 1882), 9; Chauncey A. Goodrich, in his revision of Webster's *Dictionary* (Springfield, Mass., 1851), xv, xxii.

<sup>3</sup> Wood MS.; Flanders, II, 63-64.

proceedings. Noah Webster habitually spoke of him as one of the "three mighties" of the Connecticut bar—the other two being William Samuel Johnson and Titus Hosmer.<sup>1</sup>

However this testimony may need to be qualified, it is clear that Ellsworth's professional career was extraordinary. It is doubtful if in the entire history of the Connecticut bar any other lawyer has ever in so short a time accumulated so great a practice. It probably reached its height in the years immediately after the war, for the great change gave rise to much litigation, and by that time his reputation was established and his powers at the full. Measured either by the amount of his business or by his earnings, it was unrivaled in his own day and unexampled in the history of the colony. Naturally shrewd, and with nothing of the spendthrift in his nature, he quickly earned a competence, and by good management he increased it to a fortune which for the times and the country was quite uncommonly large<sup>2</sup>. From a few documents still in existence, it is clear that he became something of a capitalist and investor. He bought land and houses, and loaned out money at interest. He was a stock-holder in the Hartford Bank and one of the original subscribers to the stock of the old Hartford Broadcloth Mill (1788)<sup>3</sup>. But if there were no documents to show the extent of his wealth, his house in Windsor still exists to prove that he was a man of means.

Were this substantial progress and worldly prosperity alone to be considered, we should be sure at least that Ellsworth was a man among men, surpassing the great majority of his contemporaries in sense and energy, a good representative of the strong and sturdy stock he came of. He was not of those who, though fitted for exceptional services or charged with uncommon talents, are yet unequal to the world's incessant and more commonplace demands. But the fact of his getting on so well and fast has its full value to the biographer only when it is added that not one word has come down to us to intimate that there was ever brought against him the slightest charge of trickery or overreaching, or the least insinuation that as a lawyer he was ever accused of any practice at all out of keeping with either his own personal dignity or the standards of the bar. On the contrary, in the praise of his contemporaries his integrity is emphasized quite as often as his ability.

As to the kind and the quality of his excellence as a lawyer, these

<sup>1</sup> Trumbull, *Memorial History of Hartford County*, I, 121.

<sup>2</sup> Inventory of his estate, made, doubtless, very soon after his death. The whole was estimated at about \$127,000.

<sup>3</sup> Ellsworth papers in the public library of the city of New York; Trumbull, *Memorial History of Hartford County*, I, 331, 564.

attempts at portraiture agree fairly well among themselves. They seem also to confirm his own conclusion that he lacked imagination; but in other respects they by no means sustain his extremely modest estimate of his gifts. Dr. John Trumbull, the author of *McFingal*, was doubtless the best wit in the colony, if not in all the colonies, and hardly, therefore, the sort of man to grow enthusiastic over a display of mere unilluminated energy in oratory. He was also himself a lawyer and a judge. And he has left a good comparison between the two foremost advocates of the bar to which he belonged. "When Dr. Johnson rose to address a jury," he said, "the polish and beauty of his style, his smooth and easy flow of words, and sweet, melodious voice, accompanied with grace and elegance of person and manner, delighted and charmed his hearers. But, when Ellsworth rose, the jury soon began to drop their heads, and, winking, looked up through their eyebrows, while his eloquence seemed to drive every idea into their very skulls in spite of them."<sup>1</sup> Johnson<sup>2</sup>, though now but little known, was no mean figure to be thus put forward first in order to a climacteric contrast. The son of the first president of King's College—an office he himself in time succeeded to—and the holder of degrees from Yale, Harvard, and Oxford, he had enjoyed and profited by still another opportunity to acquire culture; for he had represented Connecticut several years at court. It is said that while he lived in London he was admitted to that remarkable circle which gathered round another and more famous Dr. Samuel Johnson, and that he won the great man's distinguished regard. Active in the Stamp Act Congress, and throughout that phase of the colonies' resistance, he was perhaps the foremost man in Connecticut until his unwillingness to go the lengths of an attempt at complete independence left him a few years in retirement. His work in the constructive period after the war was second only to Roger Sherman's and Ellsworth's.

To the less restrained of his and Ellsworth's eulogists he appeared always as the Cicero to the other's Demosthenes.<sup>3</sup> It is more important to be sure of the real sources of the strength of a public character than to define his limitations. Stilted, therefore, as this praise of the two colonial lawyers may be, we need not reject the reasonable inference that Johnson was a pleasing and accomplished public speaker and that Ellsworth excelled in a style of oratory that

<sup>1</sup> Flanders, II, 67.

<sup>2</sup> W. G. Andrews, "William Samuel Johnson and the Making of the Constitution", in *Annual Report of the Fairfield County, Connecticut, Historical Society*, 1889; E. Edwards Beardsley, *Life and Times of William Samuel Johnson*, LL.D. (New York, 1876).

<sup>3</sup> Wood MS.

was unadorned, headlong, and compelling. Dr. Timothy Dwight, sometime president of Yale, who tells us that Ellsworth was his "particular friend", described his oratory in these words<sup>1</sup>:

His eloquence, and indeed almost every other part of his character, was peculiar. Always possessed of his own scheme of thought concerning every subject which he discussed, ardent, bold, intense, and masterly, his conceptions were just and great; his reasonings invincible; his images glowing; his sentiments noble, his phraseology remarkable for its clearness, and precision; his style concise, and strong; and his utterance vehement and overwhelming. Universally, his eloquence strongly resembled that of Demosthenes; grave, forcible, and inclined to severity.

Elsewhere the same authority describes him in his address to the jury as frequently pouring out "floods of eloquence which were irresistible and overwhelming".<sup>2</sup> To this, quoted by Joseph Wood, an unknown marginal commentator on Wood's manuscript makes answer, "Dwight must have drawn on his imagination, for Ellsworth was by no means an eloquent speaker." But Wood rejoins, "Dwight was not mistaken, as can be abundantly shown."

Fortunately, there is at least one portrait of the man and the advocate which is convincingly discriminating and restrained. A few years after Ellsworth's death there was published in the *Analectic Magazine*<sup>3</sup> an appreciation which is probably still the best portrayal of his intellectual character and methods:

He had not laid a very deep foundation either of general or of professional learning; but the native vigour of his mind supplied every deficiency; the rapidity of his conceptions made up for the want of previous knowledge; the diligent study of the cases which arose in actual business, stored his mind with principles; whatever was thus acquired was firmly rooted in his memory; and thus, as he became eminent, he grew learned. The whole powers of his mind were applied, with unremitted attention to the business of his profession, and those public duties in which he was occasionally engaged. Capable of great application, and constitutionally full of ardour, he pursued every object to which he applied himself with a strong and constant interest which never suffered his mind to flag or grow torpid with listless indolence. But his ardour was always under the guidance of sober reason. His cold and colourless imagination never led him astray from the realities of life to wanton in the gay visions of fancy; and his attention was

<sup>1</sup> Timothy Dwight, *Travels in New-England and New-York* (4 vols., New Haven, 1821-1822), I, 301, 303.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted in Flanders, II, 66.

<sup>3</sup> "Biographical Memoir of Oliver Ellsworth", in volume III (May, 1814), 382-403. The author is supposed to have been Gulian C. Verplanck, of New York, a grandson of William Samuel Johnson. See William Cullen Bryant's memorial discourse on Verplanck, May 17, 1870, New York Historical Society Publications, 1870.



seldom distracted by that general literary curiosity which so often beguiles the man of genius away from his destined pursuit, to waste his powers in studies of no immediate personal utility. At the same time his unblemished character, his uniform prudence and regularity of conduct, acquired him the general confidence and respect of his fellow citizens—a people in a remarkable degree attentive to all the decorum and decencies of civilized life.<sup>1</sup>

It is the old story, perhaps, of the will's supremacy; of the central principle, the fighting, vital instinct in a human being, proving, in the long run, of superior importance to any gifts or want of gifts. It is useless to recur to the old contrast and controversy between the men who succeed and accomplish chiefly by reason of what is commonly called character and the men who, with finer instincts and keener susceptibilities and rarer talents, too often end in failure, leaving the world no better for their lives. To most readers Ellsworth's life would doubtless be a more attractive study if, instead of exhibiting such a steady growth in tasks and competence, he and his career were found irregularly brilliant, appealing, with a series of ups and downs, of faults and atonements, to the whole wide range of our human sympathies. It is only in a sober mood, with daylight senses, that one can follow with interest and with understanding the course of such a life. The guiding genius of it all was an English constancy, quickened with a New England keenness, an American capacity and readiness for change. It is impossible to read the descriptions which his contemporaries have made of him without the feeling that nearly all they say of him would apply, with but slight abatements, to hundreds of other New England men, unknown or famous. His distinction consists chiefly in the enlargement of powers and merits which are not uncommon in themselves.

Yet I think we should be mistaken if we were led to believe that Ellsworth was commonplace in either his personality or his parts. Were we to search out the one human characteristic or endowment that has achieved the most, for good or evil, in the whole history of mankind, we should doubtless fix on that one central gift of ardor, energy, or purpose, which was surely his. Nothing else will so invariably, so finally, command our homage. It stands, better than all the other gifts and graces put together, the test of actual results. Unlike the others, it is most impressive not in first encounters but through long acquaintance and the fullest trial. Men of many or of brilliant gifts may quickly stir our admiration, or, if we are adversaries, afflict us with immediate discomfitures. The man with this gift, particularly if in his case it is not advertised or indexed by more obvious superiorities, has always in his conflicts and rivalries

<sup>1</sup> *Analectic Magazine*, III, 385-386.

the advantage of a strength concealed. One does not guess the lengths of effort he will go to, the perfect use that he will make of all his forces. In all his engagements he will present to his more brilliant adversaries a front like that the sober infantry of Sparta showed so often to the varied and imposing line of the Athenians—an opposition far more daunting than banners and war-songs. Like the Spartans at Mantinea, such men do not need to hearten themselves with telling over to themselves the reasons why they ought to win their battles; they need only remember, what all brave spirits know, that battles are not won till they are fought, that tasks are not accomplished by merely proving one's ability to do them.<sup>1</sup>

But Ellsworth had also a quickness of perception, a swiftness in the use of all his mental powers, which may well be accounted as of itself a talent—and a talent of the highest value. Without it, for instance, he could scarcely have handled at all the great mass of his professional work, interrupted as it was with public demands upon his time. His rule, to go at once to the main points of his cases, or of whatever matter he had in hand, seems, and doubtless was, as he formed it, a counsel of modesty; but is it not a rule which we should all most gladly follow if we could? He excelled particularly in expositions. His argument was frequently convincing when he had done no more than merely state the case. More than one observer of his life told Wood of this peculiar excellence of his oratory.<sup>2</sup> If he was systematic and cautious, he was no mere plodder in his work.

Nor was he in fact wanting in the power of commanding respect and attention for his own sake, apart from his work. For that effect, also, in the immediate contact with one's fellows, the central gift is probably the best of all, particularly as the possessor of it advances in achievement and self-confidence. Aided as it was in Ellsworth's case by an uncommon physical endowment, it was enough to make him, according to one perhaps too glowing eulogist, a person of extraordinary presence. It is Dr. Dwight who on this point is again the loudest in his praise. "Mr. Ellsworth," he wrote,<sup>3</sup> "was formed to be a great man. His person was tall, dignified, and commanding; and his manners, though wholly destitute of haughtiness, and arrogance, were such, as irresistibly to excite in others, wherever he was present, the sense of inferiority. His very attitude inspired awe." He adds that "in every assembly, public and private, in which he appeared, after he had fairly entered public life, there was probably no man, when Washington was not present, who would be more

<sup>1</sup> See Thucydides, *Peloponnesian War*, V, 69.

<sup>2</sup> Wood MS.; Flanders, II, 66.

<sup>3</sup> Dwight, *Travels in New-England*, I, 302, 303.

readily acknowledged to hold the first character." Dwight, no doubt, was partial to Ellsworth both as his own personal friend and as a Connecticut worthy; but the tribute is sustained by other men's accounts of him. Hollister, for instance, who in writing his *History of Connecticut* seems to have drawn freely on the recollections of his elders, makes a very similar portrait:<sup>1</sup>

Ellsworth was logical and argumentative in his mode of illustration, and possessed a peculiar style of condensed statement, through which there ran, like a magnetic current, the most delicate train of analytical reasoning. His eloquence was wonderfully persuasive, too, and his manner solemn and impressive. His style was decidedly of the patrician school, and yet so simple that a child could follow without difficulty the steps by which he arrived at his conclusions. That he also had the best judicial powers that were known in that elder age of our republic, will not be disputed. Add to these qualities, an eye that seemed to look an adversary through, a forehead and features so bold and marked as to promise all that his rich deep voice, expressive gestures and *moral fearlessness*, made good, add above all that reserved force of scornful satire, so seldom employed, but so like the destructive movements of a corps of flying artillery, and the reader has an outline of the strength and majesty of Ellsworth.

All alike bear testimony that the impressiveness of his person and demeanor was never marred by the least haughtiness or superciliousness. His manners, though perfectly dignified, were also perfectly simple and democratic.

To attempt in this fashion a character of the man while he is still at the threshold of his life-work is doubtless a somewhat unusual proceeding. It is better, as a rule, to reveal a personality with incidents; to let the man's own words and deeds make plain his quality. But that preferred biographic method is peculiarly hard to apply to Ellsworth, partly for reasons that have already been suggested. In his recorded activities, as well as in his scanty writings and his all-too-few recorded utterances, there is too little of self-revelation, too little of what we can be sure was characteristic. It is necessary, if we would gain any distinct and personal vision of him, to use at once the aids we have at hand from men who saw him in the flesh. Moreover, his tasks were often so momentous, and those which were constructive in their nature have proved so lastingly, so increasingly important, that we are moved to use what knowledge we can get of him as a means to explain his achievements, and to judge how great his part was in those he shared with others, rather than to treat his work merely as the means to study him. There are few lives in which what may be called the public values so outweigh the personal.

<sup>1</sup> Gideon Hiram Hollister, *History of Connecticut* (New Haven, 1855, 2 vols.), II, 441-442.

It was doubtless his growing reputation as a lawyer and his membership in the assembly that caused him to be drawn at once into the stirring activities of the great year 1775, and determined what his part in them should be. Of his part in the patriot movement up to this time little is recorded. It is stated that he was for a while a member of the militia or of some other volunteer force, and that he was once or twice called into the field, though never engaged in any action.<sup>1</sup> But when or where he served is no better known than when or where he was earlier engaged in school-teaching. Wood says that his service was in the militia during the Revolutionary War, when the state was threatened with invasion.<sup>2</sup> It does appear, however, that he was from the first thoroughly in sympathy with the popular feeling and early committed to the movement of resistance. When the crisis came, he would have been cold indeed if from any sort of conservatism he had stood apart from his kindred and his neighbors.

The whole story, if one reviews it afresh from the point of view of manhood, which is so very different from that childish acceptance of heroism and virtue and devotion as mere matters-of-course with which one heard it first, remains, surely, one of the most inspiring and astounding ever told. The Revolution, considered as a popular movement, was singularly noble and singularly wise. Much in our more recent past that has been highly vaunted seems, by comparison, in spite of its bigness, vapid, showy, and half-hearted. Save only in the nobler passages of the long fight over slavery, we find nowhere else in our history such wonderful sincerity and simplicity, such recklessness of all but high considerations, such courage of convictions, so childlike and magnificent a confidence in principle. The best virtue that has yet appeared in our national life and character was all encompassed in the flame of that first enthusiasm. No civic or citizenly quality we now possess surpasses, or could surpass, the spirit of nationality that leapt alive in all the towns and little cities and plantations from New Hampshire to Georgia when the obstinate king and the vain ministry, instead of thanking their stars that they were safely past the trouble over the Stamp Act, blundered on to the tax on tea and the Boston Port Bill.

None of the colonies caught fire more quickly than Connecticut. The little province proved a veritable tinder-box. Ten years before, her government had responded to the first announcement of the Stamp Act programme with the promptest and firmest of remonstrances. Jared Ingersoll, who was at once commissioned a special

<sup>1</sup> Flanders, II, 68.

<sup>2</sup> Wood MS.

agent at London, probably accomplished more than any other of the agents there by way of inducing the ministry to soften the intended blow. Yet when he himself returned as the stamp master of the colony, an uprising of the people, bigger and more determined than he or any other had foreseen, forced him, in the most spectacular manner, to resign the office. The Sons of Liberty, headed by Rufus Putnam, were strong in all the towns of the colony; it has even been claimed that the order originated there. In her earlier controversies with the home government, Connecticut's course, though resolute, had been peculiarly cautious and respectful.<sup>1</sup> But from this time not even Massachusetts was more openly defiant. Roger Sherman, a lawyer-merchant of New Haven, "between fifty and sixty, a solid, sensible man", took stronger ground than even Otis or John Adams on the question of the right of the home government to control the trade of the colonies.<sup>2</sup> Sherman had been more or less concerned in public affairs for twenty years; but now, retired from business, he gave his whole time to the service of his colony and the cause of the colonies in general. In all the general measures of protest and resistance against those acts of the home government which were deemed oppressive, the government, the towns, and the people of Connecticut were eager and enthusiastic. Watching with intense concern the course of events in Massachusetts, they expressed by words and acts that were anything but uncertain their sympathy and anger. When Townshend's act to tax the colonies was passed, Connecticut merchants entered generally into the non-importation agreement, and they seem to have kept it better than their neighbors of New York. In 1770, after many indignant town-meetings, that perfect means of popular agitation, delegates from all the towns met at New Haven to insist upon a programme of non-importation and the building up of home manufactures. The sentiment against the use of articles imported from Great Britain rose to violent heights and expressed itself in many ways, some of which were fairly comical. In 1770 Jonathan Trumbull entered upon the office of governor, which by successive annual elections he continued to hold for fourteen years. Men like Jefferson and Henry and Rutledge held the same office in other colonies at different times in the Revolutionary era, but for his conduct of the office itself Trumbull doubtless outranks them all. He was not merely in sympathy with the popular movement, he was a bold and devoted leader

<sup>1</sup> Johnston, *Connecticut*, chap. xvi, *passim*.

<sup>2</sup> Diary of John Adams in *Works*, II, 343. See also Lewis Henry Boutell, *The Life of Roger Sherman* (Chicago, 1896), 63-64, 84. Perhaps the best account of Connecticut in the Revolution is still the old-fashioned but readable narrative of Hollister, in his *History of Connecticut*, II, chaps. v-xviii.

of it. Not even Putnam went beyond him in courage, and he exhibited moreover a statesmanlike wisdom and a shrewdness that was equal to his enthusiasm. He came in time to enjoy in an extraordinary degree the confidence and affection of Washington. It was Washington who gave him his sobriquet of "Brother Jonathan".

Save that the actual collision came first at Boston, there was nothing to distinguish the resistance of Connecticut from that of Massachusetts. If anything, the people and the towns of Connecticut were in even greater haste than those of Massachusetts to proclaim that the fight was their fight. When the ministry abandoned all the duties except those on tea and made its attempt to force tea into the colonial ports, the people of Connecticut had no opportunity for a tea-party of their own. But when General Gage arrived at Boston to carry out the Port Bill and the other force bills of 1774, the Connecticut towns came to Boston's rescue with generous contributions and the most open sympathy; and the Connecticut assembly, being then in session, took the lead in calling for another Continental Congress. The excitement rose to fever-heat as one after another the fateful moves were made by Gage on the one hand and Adams and Hancock and Warren on the other. At last came the runners with tidings of bloodshed at Lexington and Concord, and Putnam, dropping his historic plow in its unfinished furrow, was for a moment in consultation with Trumbull at Lebanon and then away on his ride of a hundred miles and more in eighteen hours to Concord, the militia following him, first in little squads, then in companies, and then in regiments. Arnold, the New Haven storekeeper, seizing without authority the powder he needed for his company, was gone, too, on his way to Cambridge and Ticonderoga and Quebec, and to immortality and infamy. The plan of the attack on Ticonderoga and Crown Point was instantly conceived at Hartford, and the means to furnish the expedition were subscribed by Connecticut men. When it reached the Green mountains, it was joined there by Ethan Allen and others who were themselves Connecticut men by birth. It was finally paid for by the Connecticut assembly.

That body was in session by the twenty-sixth of April, nine days after the fighting in Massachusetts; and the deputy from Windsor was at once engaged with his fellows upon measures from which there could be no retreat.<sup>1</sup> They passed an embargo on food-stuffs; sent a committee to wait on Gage with a powerful remonstrance from Governor Trumbull, and another committee to look after supplies for those citizens who were gone already to the relief of Massachusetts; commissioned runners to keep them informed of all the

<sup>1</sup> *Colonial Records of Connecticut*, XIV, 413-440.

new and startling happenings; organized one-fourth of the militia into six full regiments, officered them, and looked about for arms and powder to equip them; imposed new taxes to cover these preparations; and called on all the ministers with their congregations to "cry mightily to God".<sup>1</sup> To supervise the expenditures for these warlike activities they also constituted a commission called the Committee of the Pay Table; and one of the four members was Ellsworth.<sup>2</sup> It was perhaps because of this, his first Revolutionary task, that Ellsworth's name does not thereafter appear in the rolls of the assembly until 1779. At the May session of that year he was again a deputy, this time for Hartford<sup>3</sup>; but at the October session, having been chosen to the Council of Safety,<sup>4</sup> he did not sit.

The work of the Pay Table seems to have steadily increased from the beginning. It was then empowered to audit and discharge all accounts incurred in the defense of the colony, and ordered to proceed according to such directions and rules as the assembly should pass from time to time; and from time to time the assembly did pass votes of a nature to enlarge its duties and responsibilities. It became a sort of fiscal war board, in constant correspondence with all commissaries and other persons who had to do with paying or supplying Connecticut's troops and militia. Perhaps the earliest letters of Ellsworth now extant are notes to Governor Trumbull about particular claims—dry business communications which doubtless fairly reflect the tedious and prosaic nature of the work.<sup>5</sup> There is no sign, however, that he ever complained of it; and there is evidence that he did it faithfully and well, for he was chosen for certain important missions that were necessary parts of it. In February, 1776, the Council of Safety having voted that one of the committee be sent to the general-in-chief of the Continental army to request repayment of moneys advanced by Connecticut to her contingent in his command, it was Ellsworth who went,<sup>6</sup> and thus, perhaps, he got his first introduction to Washington, who was still at Cambridge, laying siege to Boston. Ten days later, according to the minutes of the council,<sup>7</sup> "Mr. Ellsworth, having been to Genl

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, 435.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 431, for resolution.

<sup>3</sup> *The Public Records of the State of Connecticut, 1776-1780* (edited by Charles J. Hoadly, 2 vols., Hartford, 1894-1895), II, 249.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 287.

<sup>5</sup> September 18, 1776; December 1, December 6, 1777. Trumbull papers, in Massachusetts Historical Society library, many of which are published in *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 5th series, IX, X, 7th series, II, III.

<sup>6</sup> *Colonial Records of Connecticut*, XV, 235.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 238.



Washington by order etc., to obtain the money lately paid by our committee to the soldiers etc., and not able to get it, is returned and present, and convers'd with about it etc.,"—and it is voted that he or some other apply to Congress. It does not appear that he went to Philadelphia, but in May he was sent to General Schuyler to seek recovery of the sums already paid by Connecticut to troops employed in Canada.<sup>1</sup> In the following December, while the first campaign in the Jerseys was in progress, he was sent with several others into the western counties to raise reinforcements for General Lee<sup>2</sup>—one of the many extraordinary exertions of Trumbull and the people of Connecticut in the common cause. Ten years later, when debate arose in a very great company over the way in which the colonies had borne their several shares of the common burden, Ellsworth could point out, with the quiet firmness of full information, that Connecticut had done more and paid more, according to her numbers and her wealth, than any of the states whose representatives dared to criticize her. It is also to be remembered that this first work of his, petty and local though it seems, was yet of a sort that was quite as vital to the cause as any of the stirring and heroic things Arnold and Putnam were doing in the field. If it had only been as well done everywhere as it was by Connecticut and her Pay Table, the victory might have been won sooner and the struggle would certainly have left behind it fewer unpaid bills and less derangement of the currency. Such devotion as Ellsworth showed in this employment was rarer than the soldiers' skill and bravery. It was also, no doubt, a better preparation for his later tasks in statesmanship than any sort of soldiering could possibly have been.

In 1779 he took his seat in the Council of Safety<sup>3</sup>, and there his duties were of the same sort that occupied the Board of War, the chief executive arm of the Continental Congress. This may perhaps have been a promotion; but two years earlier he had taken another office which probably demanded more of him in time and energy than it paid for in either money or distinction. In 1777 he was chosen state's attorney for Hartford county.<sup>4</sup> The office, insti-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, 314-315.

<sup>2</sup> *State Records of Connecticut*, I, 109. See also, for his services on the Pay Table, *ibid.*, 183. In the Trumbull collection there is a letter from Ellsworth and Benjamin Payne to Governor Trumbull, dated at Hartford, July 10, 1779, urging him to procure artillery for the militia, to resist an impending invasion of the state. See *ibid.*, II, 358; *Massachusetts Historical Society Collections*, 7th series, II, 407-408.

<sup>3</sup> *State Records of Connecticut*, II, 287.

<sup>4</sup> Loomis and Calhoun, *Judicial and Civil History of Connecticut*, 157-162. None of Ellsworth's biographers gives the date correctly. Several sketches would lead one to think that it was 1775.

tuted in 1704 under the title of king's (or queen's) attorney, had not, during the colonial period, been eagerly sought after, though it does seem to have been held by men of very good standing. With the change of name there came no lessening of its requirements and no increase of pay. The fees were small, the cases uninviting. Yet Ellsworth continued to hold it until 1785, and all we know of him is of a nature to make us feel sure that he did not slight its duties on account of his own private practice or his various other public offices.

To these offices, that same year, 1777, another and a higher was added. At the October session the assembly resolved<sup>1</sup>:

That Roger Sherman, Eliphalet Dyar, Samuel Huntington, Oliver Wolcott, Titus Hosmer, Oliver Elsworth, and Andrew Adams, Esq<sup>rs</sup>, be and they are hereby appointed Delegates to represent this State at the General Congress of the United States in America, for the year ensuing and untill new be chosen and arrive in Congress if sitting; any one or more of them who shall be present in said Congress are hereby fully authorized and impowered to represent this State in said Congress.

The next year, when Ellsworth was again in the list, the commission was altered so as to require that not less than two nor more than four of the seven delegates should be always in attendance<sup>2</sup>. After 1779 the practice was for the towns to nominate to the assembly candidates for these places, and the order of the names, of which the first twelve were published according to these nominations, may possibly show the relative popularity of the men. In 1778, Ellsworth's name came last of twenty. In 1779, it was the fifteenth of twenty. In 1780, Ellsworth's was the first, and among the eleven names that followed it were those of Roger Sherman, Samuel and Benjamin Huntington, and others scarcely less distinguished.<sup>3</sup> He was reelected every year until, in the autumn of 1783, he resigned.

WILLIAM GARROTT BROWN.

<sup>1</sup> *State Records*, I, 417.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, II, 134-135.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 160, 264, 415, 462.

## ORIGIN OF THE TITLE SUPERINTENDENT OF FINANCE

ON Wednesday, February 7, 1781, the Continental Congress agreed to the organization of a department of finance; and they gave to the chief officer of that department the title "superintendent of finance". It is well known that a few days later (February 20) Robert Morris of Philadelphia was named by unanimous consent to take charge of the department under the new title. Accepting the place with some hesitation on May 14, he took the oath of office late in the following June, thus making his position formally complete. The position he held until November 1, 1784—for a period of more than three years. No such officer succeeded him, for the finances of the Confederation were soon after managed by a board.<sup>1</sup>

The title Superintendent of Finance as borne by Morris remained unique in American history. No one has thus far given special attention to its origin. Surmises on the subject have, it is true, been made.<sup>2</sup> Probably the most remarkable statement regarding the title stands in a single paragraph at the very opening of Professor W. G. Sumner's well-known work on Morris, a paragraph that by its vigor and decision challenges attention. "The only man in the history of the world", remarks Professor Sumner, "who ever bore the title . . . was Robert Morris . . . the office which he filled has never had a parallel."<sup>3</sup> Apparently then the title and the office were a happy inspiration of the Congress of 1780 or 1781. The point of view will serve to direct a brief inquiry into the probable source of the title of 1781.

No fact in American history is more easily authenticated than that of the wide-spread enthusiasm for France which took possession of this country as soon as the alliance of February, 1778, was known to have been established. The slightest familiarity with the newspapers from 1778 to 1783 makes this clear. This en-

<sup>1</sup> *Journals of Congress*, VII, 29, 30, 38, 79, 87, 96, IX, 169, 179, X, 7, 216, XIII, 106-107; Ellis P. Oberholtzer, *Robert Morris, Patriot and Financier*, 76; Francis Wharton, *Revolutionary Diplomatic Correspondence*, IV, 297-299, 330-333, 379-380, 412-414, 470-471, 505-506.

<sup>2</sup> Albert S. Bolles, *The Financial History of the United States*, I, 110; J. C. Guggenheimer, "The Development of the Executive Departments, 1775-1789", in *Essays in the Constitutional History of the United States* (edited by J. F. Jameson), 147, 154, note 3, 155. Both writers suggest that the title may be French in origin.

<sup>3</sup> William G. Sumner, *The Financier and the Finances of the Revolution*, I, 1.

thusiasm for France asserted itself in America at a time when the chief and almost overpowering problem was that of establishing a new form of government, a government that should be strong in structure and capable above all things of being successfully administered. This was indeed the one great practical problem of the Revolutionary as well as of the following epoch. Whatever form the government should ultimately assume, it was clear to a few constructive and liberal minds—to such men as Hamilton, Franklin, Jay, Robert Morris, and, let us add to the list, Pelatiah Webster of Philadelphia—that a sound government must rest on a well-administered national system of finance.

The various committees and boards that had attempted to direct financial matters since June 3, 1775, had proved inadequate. The committees sometimes lacked ability. Moreover the committee and board system was bound to lack real vigor, a fact that Robert Morris appreciated as early as 1776 when he wrote to the Committee of Secret Correspondence that “if the Congress mean to succeed in this contest, they must pay good executive men to do their business as it ought to be, and not lavish millions away by their own mismanagement”.<sup>1</sup> That Congress was soon ready to consider foreign methods of administering the finances, if it could by so doing bring order into the government and strengthen the credit, is clear enough. The very year of the French alliance they made a direct appeal to Dr. Richard Price, the well-known English writer on finance and a warm friend to the Revolutionary cause, to come to America and help reorganize the continental finances.<sup>2</sup> Early in the following year Congress resolved to urge its European agents to inquire into any methods known abroad of administering departments of war, treasury, naval, and other offices.<sup>3</sup> But nothing came of these efforts. When by the spring of 1780 Congress was considering the project of placing Morris at the head of a department of finance, they were doubtless moved by a conviction that was wide-spread—in brief that the only hope for the continental finances, and so for the progress of the war and the ultimate establishment of a strong government, lay in the appointment of trustworthy, capable “heads” of administration, men outside of Congress and responsible to it.

Perhaps the most famous expression of this conviction is Alexander Hamilton's. In the autumn of 1780 he declared to James Duane that “Congress should instantly appoint” a secretary of foreign affairs, a president of war, a president of marine, a financier,

<sup>1</sup> Peter Force, *American Archives*, fifth series, III, 1241 (December 16, 1776).

<sup>2</sup> Wharton, *Revolutionary Diplomatic Correspondence*, II, 474, 756.

<sup>3</sup> *Secret Journals of Congress*, II, 130 (January 25, 1779).

and a president of trade. That Hamilton had his eye upon French administration is clear from his remark that "these officers should have nearly the same powers and functions as those in France analogous to them".<sup>1</sup> But neither Hamilton's writings nor the arid pages of the *Journals of Congress* give more than very vague suggestions of foreign influence, French influence in particular, working on American minds.

The principle of one-man rule in the executive offices had won its way to results when in January and February, 1781, Congress resolved to appoint three secretaries—for foreign affairs, war, and marine—and a "superintendent of finance". The organization of the department of finance was outlined, it will be remembered, on February 7; and that day marked the adoption of the title.<sup>2</sup>

Close scrutiny of American newspapers and pamphlets between 1778 and 1781 leads to the conclusion that the title Superintendent of Finance was first employed with a sense of its applicability to an American officer by Pelatiah Webster of Philadelphia. In February, 1780—exactly a year before Congress placed on its records the title Superintendent of Finance—Webster declared in print "that a suitable person for the great office of *Financier-General*, or *Superintendent of Finance*, should be looked up, and appointed as soon as may be."<sup>3</sup> In order to bring Webster's usage of the title into fuller significance a word should be given to Webster's career.

A Yale graduate in 1746, Pelatiah Webster began work as a clergyman. After about ten years, however, he turned his energies to mercantile business, settled in Philadelphia, and there accumulated a fortune. What leisure he could get he devoted to reading and study, especially in the field of finance and trade. His patriotic zeal carried him far along in his favorite studies. As early as 1776 he began to write for the purpose of helping to solve some of the intricate financial and trade problems already confronting Congress and the country. His collected writings, a volume of well-known essays published four years before his death, are a sure record of his ability, his knowledge of national finance, and his insight into various problems of governmental administration. One may reasonably say that Webster was the maturest American writer on the subject of trade and finance in the epoch of the Revolution. Madison recognized his ability in 1781 and paid a tribute to it later. And

<sup>1</sup> *The Works of Alexander Hamilton*, edited by Henry Cabot Lodge (Federal edition, 1904), I, 225, 226.

<sup>2</sup> *Journals of Congress*, VII, 11-12, 16, 23-25, 29.

<sup>3</sup> *Political Essays* (Philadelphia, 1791), 90-91. The original statement appeared February 10, 1780.

it is well known that Webster was consulted from time to time by members of the Continental Congress.<sup>1</sup>

Like many loyal Americans, Webster was deeply interested in the French alliance. The next year (August, 1779), considering the subject of trade and finance, he wrote: "A good *financier* is as rare as a *phœnix*, there is but here and there one appears in an age, yet in our present circumstances, a good financier is as necessary as a general, for the one cannot be supported without the other".<sup>2</sup> He touched upon the same theme in January, 1780. "In the appointment of an officer of the revenue, or expenditures of the public monies . . . it is necessary", he remarked, "most essentially necessary, that he should be a man of known *industry, economy, and thriftiness in his own private affairs.*" And he went on to "propose, that a *financier or comptroller of finances*, be appointed, whose sole object and business should be to superintend the finances. . . . If a man adequate to this business could be found, I conceive his appointment would be of the highest utility . . . as we may easily conceive only by imagining the benefits which might have resulted from such an appointment, had such an one been made five years ago."<sup>3</sup> Financial management must be "the work of *one mind*"—such was Webster's repeated advice.<sup>4</sup> The following month he employed for the first time in print the title Superintendent of Finance. And throughout the year 1780 Webster's pen was busy on matters pertaining to trade and finance.

Within the fortnight preceding the organization of a department of finance there appeared in consecutive numbers of the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, January 24 and 31, 1781, two essays by Webster.<sup>5</sup> In the second essay the author once more tried among other things to enforce the need of placing "men of genius, abilities, integrity and industry" over executive departments. The first essay bore the significant title, "A DISSERTATION *on the Nature, Authority and Uses of the Office of a FINANCIER-GENERAL, or SUPERINTENDANT OF THE FINANCES.*" In it Webster remarked that the office of a Financier-General or "Superintendent" had for some time been contemplated. While the subject was comparatively a new one in America, he had, he added, thought much about it. Then he pro-

<sup>1</sup> The chief facts in Webster's life are given in Professor Franklin B. Dexter's *Biographical Sketches of the Graduates of Yale College*, II, 97-102, including a list of all of Webster's known essays and pamphlets. Madison's tribute will be found in *The Madison Papers* (ed. Gilpin), II, 706-707. See also Webster's *Political Essays*, 116, note, 189.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 49.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 69, 72-73, 88-89.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 72, 170-171, 268.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 152-161, 162-171.

ceeded to define the duties of such an office very much as they were defined a fortnight later by Congress. He concluded a part of his essay by saying: "this office does not interfere with any other offices of the revenue or expenditures; such as the office of Treasurer or Treasury Board, Auditor of Accounts, &c. &c. This office begins where they end." In brief, Webster's conception of the office was that of a great minister of finance, a veritable Superintendent of the Finances, for in the same essay he wrote: "A good Financier is much the rarest character to be found of any in the great departments of state. France has had but three in four hundred years, viz. the Duke of Sully, under Henry IV. Colbert, under Louis XIV. and Mr. Neckar. England has not had one since Queen Elizabeth's time." Recalling the titles of Colbert and Necker as *contrôleur-général* and *directeur-général* respectively, one is led by a process of elimination straight to the conclusion that Webster's "Superintendent" was probably suggested by Sully's title of *superintendant des finances*.

Both essays, one might readily conjecture, were written to help forward a plodding and limping Congress, for very soon after their appearance the leading suggestions in these essays were put into force. Webster was, so far as I am aware, the single writer who during 1780-1781 used the title with a view to its applicability to an American officer. Whether or not he suggested the title to Congress—and there is no express evidence regarding the matter—there can be no reasonable doubt that the title was associated by Webster and his contemporaries with the Duke of Sully.

Why under the circumstances of 1780 should not Americans—at least American students of finance and well-read statesmen—catch at the name of Sully and to some extent inform themselves of the man whose name had become a byword indicative of capacity in reëstablishing his country's finances at a critical stage? A hundred and twenty years before Robert Morris was named American Superintendent of Finance, Louis XIV, in September, 1661, dismissed Nicolas Fouquet from the French office of *superintendant* or *surintendant des finances*.<sup>1</sup> And at that time the French title was suppressed. The title had come to designate the chief financial minister of the administration. It had been the official title of numerous figures in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but among these no man had been abler or more conspicuous in his generation by his ability and afterward through his *Mémoires* than Maximilien de Béthune, Baron de Rosny and Duc de Sully. For some twelve

<sup>1</sup> The form *superintendant* was the usual one until the seventeenth century. Then it was gradually superseded by the contracted *surintendant*.



years, from 1599 till after the death of Henry IV, Sully served in the capacity of superintendent. He succeeded so well in establishing the monarchy on a surer economic and political basis that in the course of time he came to be readily cited as the example of a statesman who at a critical epoch not only saved his country from wreckage, but introduced measures which later French statesmen and others could not ignore. In fact Sully was the single really great figure in the French superintendency.<sup>1</sup>

France in the eighteenth century took a new interest in the Duke of Sully. Falling rents, overtaxation, and financial embarrassment, the commercial struggle with Great Britain—all these matters led thoughtful statesmen about the middle of the century to seek to formulate the laws of national prosperity. As a matter of course the days of Henry IV and the financial expedients of Henry's great superintendent came to mind. The *économistes* quoted Sully. Literary men wrote essays upon him. In the latter half of the century his name was heard with some frequency in French political songs and popular epigrams. Even Louis XV and members of the court circle read Sully's writings.<sup>2</sup>

In 1745 Sully's *Mémoires* appeared, recast and simplified by the Abbé Pierre Mathurin de l'Écluse des Loges. There were at least a dozen French editions of this work by 1781. Translated into English ten years later (1755), in its English dress it ran through some ten editions by the same time.<sup>3</sup> There was in John Adams's library

<sup>1</sup> There is no detailed study of the origin and development of the French superintendency in existence. Altogether the most notable article on the subject is Arthur de Boislisle's "Semblançay et la Surintendance des Finances", in *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de France*, 1881, 225-274. Valuable glimpses of the office will be found in the *Économies Royales* of Sully (vols. XVI and XVII in Michaud's *Nouvelle Collection des Mémoires relatifs à l'Histoire de France*, Paris, 1857; *Lettres, Instructions et Mémoires de Colbert* (ed. Pierre Clément, Paris, 7 vols., 1861-1870), especially vol. II; P. Clément, *Histoire de la Vie et de l'Administration de Colbert* (Paris, 1846), introductory chapter, 1-70; *Écrits Inédits de Saint-Simon* (ed. A. P. Faugère, Paris, 8 vols, 1880-1893).

<sup>2</sup> *Mémoires et Journal Inédit du Marquis d'Argenson* (Bibliothèque Elzevirienne, Paris, 5 vols., 1857-1858), II, 76-77, V, 10-11; *Mémoires du Duc de Luynes sur la Cour de Louis XV (1735-1758)* (ed. by L. Dussieux and E. Soulié, Paris, 17 vols., 1860-1865), VII, 99. A typical use of Sully was made by François Quesnay in the famous *Tableau Économique* (1758), pp. 3-6 of the facsimile reproduction issued for the British Economic Association in 1894. A widely-read essay from the pen of Antoine Léonard Thomas, later a member of the French Academy, was entitled *Éloge de Maximilien de Béthune, Duc de Sully, Surintendant des Finances, principal Ministre sous Henri IV.*; it was published at Lyons in 1763, was soon translated into Swedish and German, and was reprinted in Richard de Bury's *Histoire de la Vie de Henri IV* (3d ed., 1779). For references to Sully of a popular nature, see *Chansonnier Historique du XVIIIe Siècle* (ed. Émile Raunié, Paris, 10 vols., 1879-1884), vols. VIII, IX, X, *passim*. For a further bibliography of Sully, see *La Grande Encyclopédie*, s. v. Sully.

<sup>3</sup> Based on Quérard, Brunet, Graesse, and catalogues of the large libraries.

a French edition of 1767, portions of which he had certainly read before the American Revolution.<sup>1</sup> Washington had in his library an English edition of 1778 in six volumes.<sup>2</sup> No doubt many Americans were familiar with Sully through these *Memoirs*. There was in the volumes no more interesting passage than the long description of the qualities essential to a capable finance minister, including a detailed account of Sully's management of the organization of his day while he acted as superintendent of the French finances.<sup>3</sup>

There appeared in the *Pennsylvania Journal* of November 8, 1780—three months before Congress outlined its department of finance—a brief paragraph addressed to the editor (Mr. Bradford), and signed "A. B." The paragraph read:

The following Account of the state of France, when the Duke of SULLY, in the reign of Henry the fourth undertook the management of the finances of that kingdom, and of the conduct of that great Minister, may afford some useful instruction to your readers.

"The standing revenues brought into the King's coffers, no more than *Thirty Millions*, though *One Hundred and Fifty Millions* were raised on the people; so great were the abuses of that government in raising money; and they were not less in the dispensation of it. SULLY beheld this state of things, when he came to have the sole superintendency of affairs, with horror. He was ready to despair; but he did not despair. Zeal for his Master, zeal for his Country, and this very State seemingly so desperate, animated his endeavours; and THE NOBLEST THOUGHT, THAT EVER ENTERED INTO THE HEAD OF A MINISTER, ENTERED INTO HIS. He resolved to make, and he made, the REFORMATION OF ABUSES, the REDUCTION OF EXPENCES, and a FRUGAL MANAGEMENT, the sinking fund for the payment of the national debts, and the sufficient fund for all the great things he intended to do, without overcharging the people. He succeeded in all.

A. B.

From what source came this quotation? Who was "A. B."? Was he Alexander Hamilton or James Duane, Pelatiah Webster or James Madison? Anonymous as the evidence is, it indicates clearly enough that a little while before Congress organized its department of finance, the Duke of Sully was in men's minds.

How easy it was to look upon Sully as the great exemplar of Morris is made sufficiently clear from the correspondence of Presi-

<sup>1</sup> Through Mr. Arthur Adams of Boston my attention was directed to the French *Mémoires* of Sully (8 vols., 1767) once owned by John Adams and now in the Boston Public Library. The earlier volumes are annotated in John Adams's hand. Cf. *The Works of John Adams* (ed. C. F. Adams, 10 vols., 1850-1856), IX, 404.

<sup>2</sup> W. C. Lane's inventory of Washington's library in the appendix to *A Catalogue of the Washington Collection in the Boston Athenæum* (1897), 514.

<sup>3</sup> *Mémoires de Sully* (1747), I, 546-572. The passage in the English translation will be found in book X, II, 295-326 (ed. of 1763, 6 vols.).

dent Joseph Reed of Pennsylvania. Writing to his friend Searle in the spring of 1781, Reed commented on the recent action of Congress in appointing Morris "Minister" of finance. Then he added: "The task of restoring the finances of this country must be a very arduous one. A Sully should have a Henry to support him, but it may be doubted whether Sullys or Henrys are the growth of the present age."<sup>1</sup> In the autumn of the same year Reed held Morris up to General Nathanael Greene as a "pecuniary dictator". Reed considered that the "qualities" required for administering such a place as Morris held "were ability of mind, some money in hand, and a private credit for more. I believe I ought", he continued, "to have put the latter qualities first, for if Sully had been here without them, he would not have been thought of".<sup>2</sup> Coming from the president of the executive council of Pennsylvania, a man who had been in Congress and who knew, it is safe to assume, something about the secret proceedings of that body, these allusions are notable—all the more so if it is remembered that the Pennsylvania assembly and the Continental Congress met at this period under the same roof.<sup>3</sup> Perhaps they were suggested by actual knowledge regarding Congressional discussions. It is, however, probable that they indicate simply that at the time Sully was the stock example of a great financier.

Philadelphia as the seat of government was especially likely to be touched by zeal for France. There Gérard for a short time, and after him Luzerne and his secretary, Marbois, for a longer period represented their country's interests. Luzerne in particular was a conspicuous and well-liked figure in Philadelphia society. He often entertained his fellow-countrymen, and on sundry occasions he gave tavern dinners to the members of the Continental Congress.<sup>4</sup> As a matter of course after 1778 the French language was widely studied in America;<sup>5</sup> and French books, as the booksellers' lists indicate, were read. Chastellux was pleased to find that French history afforded numerous topics for conversation in Philadelphia homes.<sup>6</sup>

Such circumstantial evidence, then, as can be found points unmistakably to the French origin of the American title Superintendent of Finance. It was associated at the time of its appearance in

<sup>1</sup> William B. Reed, *Life and Correspondence of Joseph Reed* (Philadelphia, 2 vols., 1847), II, 296.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 374.

<sup>3</sup> François Jean Chastellux, *Travels in North-America in the Years 1780, 1781, and 1782* (2d ed., London, 2 vols., 1787), I, 226.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 187, note, 322-323, etc.

<sup>5</sup> *The Works of John Adams*, VII, 173.

<sup>6</sup> Chastellux, *Travels*, I, 309.

America with Sully, chief minister of Henry IV and for about twelve years the most capable occupant of the office known as *surintendant des finances*. The appearance of the title in 1780 helped mark that wide-spread zeal for France which after the alliance of 1778 involved almost all patriotic Americans. Moreover the title itself was one among many pieces of evidence which here and there in the eighteenth century revealed the new interest felt in the work and writings of the Duke of Sully. Somehow Sully's title gained Congressional attention, and in a form slightly altered from the French was adopted. It was not popular, and was never used in law after Morris's resignation of the office in 1784. It went the way of many another doctrinaire suggestion, for such, in truth, it was.

HENRY BARRETT LEARNED.

## DOCUMENTS

### *Documents on the Blount Conspiracy, 1795-1797.*

THE following documents from the British Public Record Office, the Department of State at Washington, and the Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, Paris, illustrate the proposed attack upon the Spanish possessions of North America by frontiersmen and Indians expecting aid from Great Britain, to which the name Blount's Conspiracy is commonly given. For his connection with this affair, William Blount, senator from Tennessee, former governor of the Territory South of the Ohio, was expelled from the Senate. A brief sketch of the movement is given in the REVIEW for January, 1905, X, 272-274, with citation of the material. Further references are in the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association*, 1903, II, especially the introduction, and pp. 840, 919, 990, 1015, 1048, 1068, 1075, 1079, 1091, 1098.

The so-called Blount Conspiracy must be considered in relation to the designs of France upon Louisiana; the attitude of the Tory settlers at Natchez and the retention of the Spanish posts upon the Mississippi<sup>1</sup>; England's war with Spain and her attitude toward the Mississippi valley from 1795 to 1798; Pitt's negotiations with Miranda, and the latter's overtures to Adams, Hamilton, etc.; and the critical relations of the United States with France during Adams's administration. The land speculations in New York and on the Mississippi are also related to the intrigue.

It is important to collate these documents with those in the trial of Blount: *Annals of Fifth Congress, 1797-1799*, I, 34-45, 448-466, 499 ff., 672-679; II, 2245-2416; see index to these volumes for speeches and legislative proceedings. Other important documents are in *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, II, 20-27, 66-77 (Blount's letter to Carey is on pp. 76-77), 78-103; King, *The Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, II, 196-258, *passim*; Victor Collot, *Voyage dans l'Amérique Septentrionale* (2 vols., Paris, 1826), also in translation, *A Journey in North America* (Paris, 1826).

<sup>1</sup> Peter J. Hamilton, "Running Mississippi's South Line", *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society*, II, 157-168; G. L. Rives, "Spain and the United States in 1795", *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, IV, 62-79; F. L. Riley, "Spanish Policy in Mississippi after the Treaty of San Lorenzo", *Report of American Historical Association*, 1897, 175-192, and *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society*, I, 50-66; F. L. Riley, "Transition from Spanish to American Rule in Mississippi", *ibid.*, III, 261-311.

The documents from the archives of the Department of State were found and copied by the Bureau of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution. I am indebted to Mr. C. F. Huth, graduate scholar in history in the University of Wisconsin, for assistance in preparing the annotations.

FREDERICK J. TURNER.

I. DUKE OF PORTLAND TO LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR SIMCOE.<sup>1</sup>

WHITEHALL 24<sup>th</sup> October 1795

*Sir,*

The conversations you had with Lord Grenville previous to your leaving England relative to the dispositions of the Settlers in Kentucky, and the Western Count[r]y of the Northern States, joined to your own knowledge of them render it quite unnecessary for me to point out either their connexions or interests, or the extent to which they may be made subservient to His Majesty's Service, should a rupture take place with Spain—an event which I sincerely trust may not happen, but which nevertheless admits too great a degree of possibility, not to require our being prepared to meet it with every advantage that can be placed on our side.

I am not, at this moment sufficiently apprized of the present sentiments of these Settlers or whether the jealousies which formerly subsisted between them and the Spanish Government relative to the Mississippi still continue to influence them in such a manner, as would be likely to animate them to an immediate cooperation with this Country, in case the event should take place, which I have mentioned. I am therefore desirous of being confidentially informed by you, in particular on this point, and of receiving your opinion of the effect to be produced against the Spanish Settlements in North America, by the means of such co-operation as I have supposed. In addition to which, I should also wish for your sentiments with respect to any other movements with which this measure may require to be connected.

You will clearly see for the present that no open or direct communication on the subject of this letter can be made, on our parts to the Settlers in question, that all that can be done (and *that* will require your utmost care and circumspection) is, to cultivate such an intercourse with the leading Men of those Settlements, as will be likely to give to this Country a facility and advantage in acting with them, if ever a proper occasion should occur, carefully observing not to give any umbrage, or cause of suspicion to Spain, and avoiding whatever can, in the smallest degree commit this Country with the Government of the United States or make His Majesty a Party to any attacks on the Spanish Settlements, should no circumstances arise which may call for them on our part.

<sup>1</sup> Public Record Office, War Office (Colonial), Secret Entry Book. Duke of Portland. "Original drafts signed by him." Indorsed: "Lieut Governor Simcoe Most private and secret Sent in Cypher."

I forbear to call your attention to the assistance which, in the event I have supposed, may be afforded by the Southern and Western Indians, as, in communicating your sentiments to me, in consequence of what I have already stated, you will, of course include in any supposed measures, which occasion may call for, the Services which might be derived from the above description of Persons.

Some knowledge of such parts of Lake Michigan as form or facilitate a communication with the Mississippi, its boundaries, and the connection of its Inlets, in respect to what rate of Vessels or Crafts, they may admit, may be, eventually, very material, and if an opportunity should present itself for this purpose, which in carrying into execution the several provisions contained in Our Treaty with the United States, may very well be expected, you will of course take advantage of it and transmit me a proper Chart with observations.<sup>1</sup>

I am etc

PORTLAND

## II. ROBERT LISTON TO LORD GRENVILLE.<sup>2</sup>

PHILADELPHIA 25 January 1797

To the War Department

*My Lord*

A person of the name of Chisholm who has accompanied to Philadelphia some warriors and Tribes of Indians who live on the South West Boundary of the United States has informed me that there are settled amongst these Tribes from a Thousand to Fifteen Hundred White Inhabitants principally British Subjects, attached to their Country and Sovereign, and ready to enter into a plan for the Recovery of the

<sup>1</sup> A letter in Canadian Archives, Series Q, 282-2, p. 694, dated November 23, 1796, from W. Tatham (Latham?) contains this paragraph: "I dare boldly pronounce the fallacy of any reliance of Cooperation in the Countries of Kentucky and Territory South of Ohio in Conjunction with those of Upper Canada at the present juncture. Nay, I rather doubt a tendency to support the French in settling La. through many avenues and I advance this opinion founded upon twenty years acquaintance with the premises and with almost every man of enterprise they contain, but still more on a more intimate communication with the affairs of the American States and with Generals Lee, Scott, Clarke Shelby Sevier, Martin, Robertson Gunn and others to whom General Simcoe is well known, and with some one or more of whom (whose hour is not yet come) he, I believe is in intimate correspondence and high esteem."

George Rogers Clark alleged, in a letter of March 2, 1797, that English agents from Canada were in Kentucky to enroll volunteers destined to march against Louisiana, and that some days before he had received propositions to march at the head of two thousand men against New Mexico and had refused the offer. He did not believe the English could open the campaign before July. Their plan was, as he affirmed, to take St. Louis and then divide, one division to descend the Mississippi and the other to march against Santa Fé (Baron Marc de Villiers du Terrage, *Les Dernières Années de la Louisiane Française*, Paris, n. d. 1904, 362-363). See the REVIEW, X, 274, note.

<sup>2</sup> Public Record Office, America 18.



Floridas to Great Britain<sup>1</sup> and that he is authorized to make, through me, an offer of their Services to His Majesty for that purpose. He represents the Settlers alluded to as being able with a slight degree of countenance and co-operation from Government, not only to drive the Spaniards from East and West Florida, but also to take possession of these Provinces when conquered. The Chief Conditions proposed are That His Majesty should legalize the above Enterprize by granting Commissions to a few of the Principal persons that might engage in it (which Commission however should not entitle them to pay or permanent Rank) That the British Government should send a Frigate and two or three armed Vessels with a few Field pieces to assist in making an attack on Mobile and Pensacola (if it were found necessary) and should furnish a Thousand Weight of Powder and two Thousand Weight [ ] and one Thousand Blankets for the Indians who may be willing to [engage] in the Expedition.

I shall enter more particularly into this Subject by the return of the November packet which I am in hourly expectation of seeing arrive in this Country.<sup>2</sup>

I have the honour to be, with the greatest respect, My Lord  
Your Lordships, Most Obedient Humble Servant

ROB. LISTON

R<sup>t</sup> Honble Lord Grenville

III. VICTOR COLLOT TO CARLOS MARTINEZ DE YRUJO.<sup>3</sup>

PHILADELPHIE, le 1<sup>er</sup> mars 1797.

Note remise au ministre de Sa Majesté Catholique par le général Collot relative à l'attaque de la Louïsiane projetée par les Anglais.

Je considère la haute Louïsiane dans son état actuel, ouverte de toute part, sans troupes, sans fortifications, le peuple inquiété, menacé par l'Angleterre, envié par les États-Unis, et dans un péril imminent; et si elle est encore une possession de Sa Majesté Catholique, c'est parce qu'elle n'a pas été attaquée.

La haute Louïsiane prise, la basse tombe nécessairement, et il ne faudra qu'un peu plus ou moins de tems; car je ne connais pas un poste

<sup>1</sup> Andrew Ellicott, in his *Journal* (Philadelphia, 1803), 175, says, regarding one of the committees about Natchez, that "a plan was early formed, to add to the Union, the two Floridas, with the island of Orleans, provided the Spaniards either committed hostilities against the citizens of the United States at Natchez or joined France in the contest against us. From the secrecy, talents, and enterprise of those concerned, added to a temporary system of finance, and a deposit of arms, there could not possibly be any doubt of the complete, and almost instantaneous success of the plan had it been attempted."

<sup>2</sup> Lieutenant-governor Prescott, of Quebec, wrote to Liston, February 16, 1797, of the difficulty that would attend sending supplies for the proposed expedition against the Floridas unless the people of the United States favored the enterprise, or England still held the posts south of the Lakes. *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1891, "Lower Canada", 149. See his complaints, August 31, 1797, of Pickering's having made the matter public, *ibid.*, 155.

<sup>3</sup> Deciphered. *Affaires Étrangères, États-Unis Correspondance*, vol. 47, folios 126-129, in No. 11 of Adet. General Collot had returned from his investigations in the Mississippi in January. For his career see the references referred to in the introduction.

(je le démontrerai dans mon mémoire général) qui puisse tenir huit jours devant 2.000 hommes de bonnes troupes. La haute Louïsiane entre les mains de l'Angleterre ou des Américains ouvre la porte du Nouveau-Mexique en passant entre les rivières des *Osages* et des *Arkansas* où l'on ne trouve que de hautes futayes, des prairies naturelles et pas une seule rivière à traverser. Je sais qu'on traitera en Europe cette crainte de chimérique, d'idée gigantesque ; mais moi qui connais les lieux, le caractère entreprenant des peuples qui les habitent, et les prétendues difficultés que l'on suppose que l'ennemi trouvera, je répète que, si la haute Louïsiane tombe entre les mains des Anglais ou des Américains, S<sup>te</sup>-Fé sera pillé et ravagé la campagne suivante, parce que ces deux nations seront toujours d'accord, lorsqu'il s'agira de faire de l'argent et de dépouiller Sa Majesté Catholique.

Je n'approuve donc pas par cette raison les enrôlements qu'on propose au ministre ; ils coûteront des sommes immenses et on n'en tirera aucun parti. Ils seront même très dangereux, à moins qu'il n'y ait parmi eux beaucoup de Français ; d'ailleurs, les sauvages auront une répugnance invincible à agir avec eux, et les habitants encore plus.

Je pense donc que ce qu'il y a de plus important à faire dans une circonstance aussi fâcheuse, est d'employer tous les moyens possibles, sinon pour faire échoûer cette expédition, au moins pour la retarder.

Pour cela le ministre doit : 1<sup>o</sup> s'opposer de toutes ses forces à ce que les Anglais passent sur le territoire américain pour attaquer la haute Louïsiane. Pour cet effet, je crois qu'il ne doit pas se contenter de traiter cette affaire avec le secrétaire d'État, dont la fourberie est assés connue aux deux puissances alliées, mais encore avec le président des États-Unis. Voici pourquoi : c'est que s'il arrivait que, malgré les protestations dont cet homme est prodigue, le passage fût forcé, n'étant d'aucun poids par lui-même, le gouvernement en serait quitté pour le désavouer, le chasser même au besoin pour donner une apparente satisfaction au Roy d'Espagne, et la Louïsiane n'en serait pas moins perdue.

Les Américains maîtres aujourd'hui des postes ferment aux Anglais les trois principaux passages par lesquels ils pourraient déboucher des Lacs. Le premier en partant du Détroit, remontant la petite rivière des *Mimms* [Miami] pour gagner les sources de la *Wabach* et la descendre jusqu'au poste Vincennes pour de là arriver par terre aux Illinois à Kaskasias par une très belle communication à travers un païs où on ne rencontre que des prairies naturelles.

Le second, en partant de *Michilimakinac*, passant par la baie des Puans,<sup>1</sup> remontant la rivière des Sacsouhaux<sup>2</sup>-River pour gagner par un portage de trois milles les sources de la rivière de *Ouisconsin* qui verse ses eaux dans le Mississipi.

Le 3<sup>ème</sup> en partant de *Michilimakinac*, descendant le lac *Michigan* jusqu'aux sources de la rivière des Illinois (ce qui se fait dans les grandes

<sup>1</sup> Green bay, Wisconsin.

<sup>2</sup> Sacs ou paux ? The Fox river.

eaux sans portage) pour suivre le cours de cette rivière jusques vis-à-vis S<sup>t</sup> Loüis.

Mais comme, indépendamment de ces trois passages fermés par la possession des forts américains, les Anglais pourraient néanmoins passer au dessus pour exécuter leurs desseins en rassemblant leurs forces sur le lac Supérieur et remontant la rivière *Coppe[r]mines* pour joindre par un petit portage la tête de la rivière *Vermillon* qui se jette dans celle de *Chippewa*, qui conduit au Mississipi, ou bien par là où est la baie du lac Supérieur, qui offre aussi un passage en remontant une des petites rivières du fond de cette baie, et joignant par un petit portage la tête de la rivière *Froide*, qui mène de même au Mississipi.

Le ministre d'Espagne doit, d'après cela, requérir le gouvernement américain d'établir des postes sur ces communications, ne fût-il [fussent-ils] que de 4 ou 5 hommes, ils suffiront pour constater la violation du territoire des États-Unis et leur ôter tout prétexte.

Les Anglais seront alors forcés de remonter jusqu'au lac des Bois pour gagner le territoire espagnol et la tête du Mississipi, leur ligne d'opérations sera allongée et ils perdront encore beaucoup de tems en raison des rapides, chutes et portages infinis dont toute cette partie est coupée.

Il est indispensable d'envoyer sans perdre de tems à S<sup>t</sup> Loüis un officier de génie à talent, toute cette province en étant dépourvue, pour mettre au moins hors d'insulte cette place ouverte de toutes parts, qui est la clef de la haute Loüisiane par sa position, et la facilité d'y former un bon camp retranché.

Faire approvisionner cette place par le Kentukey aussitôt qu'il sera possible, parce qu'elle sera le rendez-vous général des troupes de sauvages et le reste. Il faut d'ailleurs un tems infini pour tirer des vivres de la Nouvelle-Orléans, qui, en outre, serait certainement attaquée ou menacée en même tems par le golfe du Mexique et aurait besoin de tous ses moyens. D'ailleurs l'Angleterre, ici bien puissante, emploiera son influence aux États-Unis pour nuire à l'approvisionnement de la Loüisiane. Comme le poste de L'Anse à la graisse<sup>1</sup> est en partie détruit par les eaux et que l'automne dernier, on allait l'évacuer, il faut en transporter les troupes, l'approvisionnement et les munitions à S<sup>t</sup> Loüis, ainsi qu'une partie de la garnison des *Ecoamargot*<sup>2</sup> et les trois galères qui s'y trouvent placées un peu au dessus du Missouri et vis-à-vis de l'embouchure des Illinois pour arrêter tout ce qui pourrait descendre par cette rivière ou du haut Mississipi, avec ordre dans le cas où elles seraient forcées, d'aller s'emboîser sous le fort S<sup>t</sup> Loüis.

On doit faire occuper les postes intermédiaires par les sauvages ; bien disposés, ils rempliront les vides et empêcheront les Américains d'en prendre possession tant que la guerre durera. Je pense même que les

<sup>1</sup> New Madrid.

<sup>2</sup> Écores à Margot, Chickasaw Bluffs, Memphis, Tennessee. See REVIEW, II, 480 ; *Writings of Jefferson* (Ford's ed.), VI, 335-336.

postes New-Gales<sup>1</sup> et des Arkansas doivent être ramenés à St. Louis où leur garnison serait de la plus grande utilité ; d'ailleurs politiquement parlant, je le[s] trouve beaucoup mieux entre les mains des sauvages.

Par cette disposition, le gouvernement de la Nouvelle-Orléans, au lieu de se dégarnir, pourra renforcer les postes de la Nouvelle-Orléans, *Baton-Rouge*, *Silenque-Mines*<sup>2</sup> et autres avec les milices des Natchès (la plus part des habitants des Natchès est composé d'anciens *Tysdesers-unis*,<sup>3</sup> dévoués aux Anglais), de la pointe-coupée<sup>4</sup> et des Carolines. Quant aux Florides, la Havane doit leur fournir des secours.

Mais pour opérer un effet moral plus puissant, rallier beaucoup d'opinions, déterminer toutes les nations sauvages si nombreuses dans cette partie à s'armer, contre les Anglais, enchaîner les Américains des États de l'ouest et nord-ouest, faire prononcer les Canadiens des Lacs, il faudrait des Français ; le plus petit corps de troupes de la République non seulement sauverait cette colonie de l'ennemi commun, mais encore mettrait Sa Majesté Catholique à même de porter bientôt la guerre dans le cœur du Canada. Ce n'est pas ici jactance, orgueil national, c'est la vérité extraite de ce que j'ai vu, entendu et observé dans la reconnaissance que j'ai faite de ces contrées. Mais le tems presse, l'ennemi est à la porte, les grandes autorités sont éloignées, cette idée ne peut servir que pour l'avenir. Peut-être serait-il possible de suppléer momentanément à ces grands obstacles en faisant lever au nom de la France dans la haute Louisiane un corps de Canadiens ; j'indiquerai la forme et le lieu du rassemblement. Cette union des deux nations serait d'un grand poids et suffirait peut-être pour suspendre l'expédition des Anglais, dans le doute où ils seraient de savoir quelle part les États de l'ouest pourraient prendre à cette guerre.

Je prie le ministre de peser dans sa sagesse cette note écrite à la hâte et trop peu développée, mais qui renferme des vérités qui feront peut-être époque un jour ; car la perte de la Louisiane dans la situation où se trouvent la France et l'Espagne vis-à-vis des États-Unis, serait un des coups les plus funestes aux deux puissances alliées. On doit donc tout faire pour la sauver.<sup>5</sup>

Pour copie conforme

Signé P. A. ADET.

#### IV. GENERAL COLLOT TO CHEVALIER DE YRUJO.<sup>6</sup>

Deuxième note remise au ministre d'Espagne par le général Collot, pour servir de réponse aux différentes questions qui lui ont été adressées par ce ministre par sa lettre en date du 1<sup>er</sup> mars 1797.

Dans la première note que j'ai eu l'honneur de remettre au ministre d'Espagne, je crois lui avoir suffisamment démontré quelle était l'importance de la plan de St. Louis.

<sup>1</sup> Nogales, Walnut Hills, Vicksburg.

<sup>2</sup> Plaquemines ?

<sup>3</sup> United Tory deserters ?

<sup>4</sup> Pointe Coupée, Louisiana.

<sup>5</sup> Compare Carondelet's plan of defense, 1794, in the REVIEW, II, 474-505.

<sup>6</sup> Affaires Étrangères, États-Unis Correspondance, vol. 47, folios 130-131.

Il ne me reste plus pour répondre aux différentes questions insérées dans sa lettre en date du 1<sup>er</sup> mars 1797, qu'à lui faire connaître que la conservation de cette place (d'après sa situation topographique) dépend autant de ses soins que de ceux du gouverneur général de la Louisiane.

On ne peut révoquer en doute que toutes les fois qu'une puissance est en guerre avec une autre, le premier soin d'un fonctionnaire public est de mettre en état de défense toutes les parties sous la domination de son souverain *appelées extrêmes frontières*, sans attendre même qu'elles soient menacées, il suffit seulement qu'elles puissent l'être d'un instant à l'autre pour justifier cette sage précaution.

S<sup>t</sup> Louis est l'extrême frontière de la haute Louisiane relativement au Canada, puisque c'est à compter du Missouri que finissent les derniers établissemens formés sur le territoire de Sa Majesté Catholique dans la haute Louisiane.

La paix même ne serait pas une excuse suffisante pour ne pas mettre cette place en état de défense, puis qu'elle doit protéger par la suite du tems le commerce de ces immenses contrées, arrêter tous les envahissemens et violations de territoire de la part des Anglais, qui se sont déjà emparé[s] de la partie la plus précieuse appartenante à Sa Majesté Catholique, parce qu'ils n'ont rien trouvé qui s'y soit opposé, ainsi que je l'ai fait connaître au ministre d'Espagne, lorsque je lui ai rendu compte de mon voyage.

Que c'est de S<sup>t</sup> Louis que doivent être répartis tous les différents postes que Sa Majesté Catholique sera obligée de faire établir *sur les limites projetées* entre le Canada et la Louisiane, et empêcher par là les empiètemens auxquels les lignes de démarcation imaginaires ne fournissent que trop de prétextes aux puissances ambitieuses et de mauvaise foi.

Mais comme le ministre d'Espagne pourrait m'objecter que ces soins devraient naturellement appartenir au gouverneur de la Louisiane, je lui observerai que, quels que soient les talents et l'activité bien connus de M<sup>r</sup> le Baron de Cérondelet, il lui est impossible de porter des secours et d'approvisionner la place de S<sup>t</sup> Louis avec la même facilité et la même célérité que le ministre d'Espagne en a le pouvoir par la voye de Philadelphie, parce qu'il faut deux mois et demi de la Nouvelle-Orléans pour aller à S<sup>t</sup> Louis et qu'un seul suffit pour s'y rendre de l'État de Kentucky ; que les farines à la Nouvelle-Orléans coûtaient à mon départ 20 et 24 piastres, tandis qu'elles n'en coûtent que 5 et 6 dans les États de l'ouest. Il y a donc pour Sa Majesté Catholique économie de tems et de dépense extrêmement précieuse.

À l'égard de mon opinion sur la nécessité d'envoyer d'ici un officier du génie dans la haute Louisiane, elle est fondée sur ce que cette province en est totalement dépourvue ; que d'ailleurs l'officier que le ministre d'Espagne dépêchera d'ici doit selon tous les calculs des distances être rendu à S<sup>t</sup> Louis 6 semaines ou 2 mois avant celui que l'on pourrait tirer de la Havane.

C'est par cette même raison que je n'hésite pas à me rendre à la

demande que m'a faite le ministre d'Espagne de lui communiquer ce que je pense qu'il seroit raisonnable de faire pour mettre la place de St. Louis à l'abri d'un coup de main.<sup>1</sup>

Il trouvera, dans le projet que j'ai l'honneur de luy adresser cy-joint, ce que je pense à ce sujet, bien entendu qu'il sera soumis à l'examen de M. le Baron de Carondelet, afin qu'il puisse y faire tous les changemens, les corrections et additions qu'il croira justes et nécessaires.

Fait à PHILADELPHIE, le 9 mars 1797, (V. S.)

Signé, V. COLLOT.

Pour copie conforme

P. A. ADET.

V. ROBERT LISTON TO LORD GRENVILLE.<sup>2</sup>

PHILADELPHIA 16 March 1797

*My Lord*

The Bearer of this Letter is M<sup>r</sup> Chisholm the Gentleman mentioned in my Letters No 2 and 3 as having been charged by certain Persons inhabiting near the South West Frontiers of the United States, to propose a Plan for the Conquest of the Floridas

He has lately received Letters from some of the Adventurers who wish the most ardently to engage in the Enterprize representing in such lively Colours the facility of its Execution and the Certainty of Success at the same Time urging him so strongly to bring the Business to a conclusion before he returns among them that he felt himself irresistibly impelled to make a Voyage to Europe in order to Explain his Views to His Majesty's Ministers and to obtain a definite answer on the subject before the Season be too far advanced.

M<sup>r</sup> Chisholm's Correspondents appear to have given him an account of the Dispositions of the Inhabitants of the Spanish Territories adjoining to the United States that has persuaded him of the possibility of joining to the Acquisition of Florida the Reduction of the Forts on the Mississippi, the Conquest of New Mexico, and a Diversion that might ultimately contribute to the Independence of South America, if that were considered as a Measure essential to the Interests of Great Britain

The Certainty which the last accounts from Europe convey of the farther Continuance of the War, the Probability of the Cession of Louisiana to the French by the Spaniards, and the serious consequences that must attend it, together with the Advantages which might accrue to His Majesty's Interests from even a temporary possession of that Country are Considerations that struck me as being of such Importance as to render it improper for me to discourage the Idea of his Voyage. I have therefore consented to M<sup>r</sup> Chisholm's Proposal and have paid his Passage to England,<sup>3</sup> giving him hopes at the same time that the Expences of his

<sup>1</sup> See Collet's plan for fortifying St. Louis in his *Journey in North America*, I, 249-252, 257-264.

<sup>2</sup> Public Record Office, America 18.

<sup>3</sup> See number VII, note 3, p. 584.

Stay in London, and of his Return to this Country will be defrayed by His Majesty's Government provided the amount does not exceed the Sum of One Hundred and Fifty pounds. The charge of the whole Expedition as stated by him is so very inconsiderable and the Risk seems to come so little home to Great Britain that there appears to be hardly any objection to making the Experiment except the possibility of being imposed upon by Characters of which it is not easy to obtain a competent knowledge. But this danger might in a great degree be obviated by sending one or two Persons of Consequence to direct the operations and control the Disbursements

I shall take the first safe opportunity of mentioning further particulars of the plan of operations in Question and shall content myself at present with suggesting that although any apparent Infraction of the Neutrality of the United States might be avoided by the Proposal of Captain Chisholm that the Adventurers (who have never become Citizens of America) should all pass over to the Spanish Territory, before they begin their Military Preparations, yet there are solid Reasons against complying with the proposed Invitation to the Indian Tribes to join the King's Standard, since by the Treaty between the United States and Spain, it is expressly stipulated that the Contracting Parties shall reciprocally prevent the Commission of Hostilities by the Indians settled within their respective Boundaries, and even use Force for that Purpose if it should be found necessary. This Difficulty can hardly be otherwise done away than by a Rupture between France and America, which might also involve His Catholic Majesty and of course annul the Treaty alluded to. But there is Reason to think that the Assistance of the Indians is not absolutely necessary to the Success of the Enterprize.

As It is not unlikely that this Dispatch may be prevented from reaching your Lordship's hands I have furnished the Bearer with ostensible Letters of Recommendation to M<sup>r</sup> Hammond, but so expressed as to conceal the real object of his journey.

I have the honour to be, with the greatest respect

My Lord, Your Lordship's most obedient humble Servant  
R<sup>t</sup> Honbl<sup>e</sup> Lord Grenville

ROB. LISTON

VI. ROBERT LISTON TO [GEORGE HAMMOND ?].<sup>1</sup>

PHILADELPHIA 16 March 1797

*Dear Sir*

The bearer, M<sup>r</sup> Chisholm is the Gentleman concerning whom I wrote to you in my Letters of the 25<sup>th</sup> of January and 13<sup>th</sup> of last month to which I beg leave to refer you.

He, and his partners and employers have become impatient and he sets out with an intention of Explaining the business and procuring a definitive answer himself.

Should he be disappointed at Hamburgh, and come to London, I, with perfect confidence deliver him into your hands for every degree of

<sup>1</sup> Public Record Office, America 18.



support and assistance he may require. He is likely among other things, to need your aid to put his thoughts into proper stile and shape on paper ; for he is more used to *talk* over the praises of Lands, the advantages of their situation and the facility of their improvement than to *write* upon the Subject and our monied monied [*sic*] men are so much surfeited with eloquent descriptions that they are become fastidious and will not be affected by an artful tale.

I hope you will at all events redispach him soon for America and not allow him to spend money unnecessarily in London. I have desired Moore to supply him with what he may want during his stay but I trust the sum will not be large and I equally trust you will finally reimburse me the whole whatever it be, for my interest compared with that of the great monied men in question is next to nothing.

Captain Williamson who has been once more in town assures me the lands in the Genesee Country are by no means unhealthy when the woods are cut down and cultivation commenced but I still doubt Poor Bob Morris is at length obliged to sell, and has already advertised his magnificent possessions in this Country not excepting the palace in Chesnut Street.

I remain, with perfect truth and regard

My dear Sir

Your most obedient and faithful humble Servant

ROB. LISTON

VII. ROBERT LISTON TO JOHN D. CHISHOLM.<sup>1</sup>

Memorandum for M<sup>r</sup> Chisholm —

On arriving at Hamburgh, M<sup>r</sup> Chisholm will call on M<sup>r</sup> Goverts, to whom I have written a Letter,<sup>2</sup> and on M<sup>r</sup> Peyron, the Swedish Minister to whom I also wrote sometime ago, and who is a very excellent Man. — These two Gentlemen will be sufficient for every thing you may want, except for Money, which I know you have taken your measures to procure elsewhere.<sup>3</sup>

If you are forced to come to London, I have given you Letters which I hope will suffice for every thing, and even for Money. When you wish to correspond with me, carry your Letters to *the Secretary of States Office Downing Street Westminster*, at the beginning of a month ; at other times write by Ship.

R. L

<sup>1</sup> Department of State, Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Despatches, England, volume 5. Headed, “ — Copy — [the original in the possession of R King] ”.

<sup>2</sup> This letter to J. H. Goverts, introducing Chisholm, was given by Chisholm to King, and is printed in King, *Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, II, 198.

<sup>3</sup> Pickering in a letter to the committee of impeachment says that Liston confessed to him to have paid the passage for Chisholm and also to have given him a draft on his own banker in London for £20. Thus it may be technically true that, as Chisholm in his declaration claims, Liston had never advanced him any money (*Annals of Fifth Congress*, II, 2374 ; see also King to Secretary of State, August 28, 1797, King, *Correspondence*, II, 217-218). Thomas Davy in a letter to William Davy, dated September 13, 1797, says that Chisholm had tried in vain to borrow from him, and that the British ministry had amply supplied Chisholm with money (*Annals of Fifth Congress*, II, 2369-2370).

17. March 1797.

P: S the Originals, of which the foregoing are true Copies, are in my Possession, having been delivered to me by J. D Chisholm.

LONDON Dec. 9. 1797

RUFUS KING

VIII. GENERAL COLLOT TO CHEVALIER DE YRUJO.<sup>1</sup>

3<sup>ème</sup> Note. adressée au ministre de Sa Majesté Catholique près des États-Unis d'Amérique par le général Collot.

D'après la déposition du S<sup>r</sup> Michel, habitant du Tennessee, il paraît :

1<sup>o</sup> qu'il a été fait par le nommé Chisholm, agent anglais et habitant du Tennessee un enrôlement de 1000 habitans de cette province destinés à attaquer les postes du Bâton-Rouge, de New-Gales et des Écors à Margot appartenant à Sa Majesté Catholique.

2<sup>o</sup> que Chisholm a fait toute la reconnaissance de la Louisiane et des deux Florides, et déterminé les nations Creek et Cherokees à tourner leurs armes contre les possessions espagnoles.

3<sup>o</sup> que Chisholm a obtenu une liste de 1,500 Torys ou loyalistes anglais des Natchez, qui se sont engagés à prendre les armes en faveur des Anglais, dès qu'ils paraîtront pour attaquer la Basse Louisiane et marcher par cette conquête sur S<sup>te</sup> Fé.

4<sup>o</sup> qu'il se forme un rassemblement sur les Lacs dans le Haut-Canada, composé de 500 anglais troupe[s] de ligne, 700 canadiens, milice soldée, et 2000 sauvages des Lacs qui doivent être commandés par le chef indien *Brent*.<sup>2</sup>

5<sup>o</sup> que ce corps doit descendre par la rivière des Illinois, attaquer S<sup>t</sup> Louis, la Nouvelle-Madrid, marcher ensuite sur S<sup>te</sup> Fé en suivant les rivières S<sup>t</sup> François et des Arkansas.

6<sup>o</sup> que Chisholm s'est procuré 6 pièces de canons de campagne, qu'il a déposées sur la rivière du Tennessee entre les mains d'un de ses agens, et que ces pièces sont les mêmes autrefois destinées à l'expédition du citoyen Genet.

7<sup>o</sup> que le rendez-vous des Américains doit avoir lieu à Knoxville dans le Tennessee le 1<sup>er</sup> Juillet.

8<sup>o</sup> qu'en conséquence Chisholm, après avoir ainsi tout disposé, et après avoir fait son rapport au ministre d'Angleterre, M<sup>r</sup> Liston, est parti le 28 de mars pour Londres sur le brig — destiné pour Hambourg pour faire part de ce project au gouvernement et demander des vaisseaux et de l'argent pour son exécution.

Le S<sup>r</sup> Michel a déposé en outre qu'une partie des membres du Sénat américain était dans le secret, notamment MM. Bi——, Li——, et Ru——.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Affaires Étrangères, États-Unis Correspondance, volume 47, folios 137-139.

<sup>2</sup> Brant, the celebrated chief.

<sup>3</sup> Blount? Livermore? Rutherford? These names of senators in the Fifth Congress most nearly supply the omissions. The editor has no other reason for the conjecture.

Pour preuve de ce qu'il a avancé, le S<sup>r</sup> Michel a remis une lettre originale signée de Chisholm par laquelle il lui recommande de se trouver à l'époque convenüe à ——— pour agir en conséquence du plan arrêté. Cy-jointe copie de la lettre.<sup>1</sup>

## OBSERVATIONS

La déposition ci-dessus semble confondre deux projets hostiles contre la Louisiane qui sont également sur le tapis, mais qui n'ont aucune connexion entre eux.

Les Américains de l'ouest et les Anglais, quelque désir qu'ils aient, les uns et les autres, de chasser les Espagnols de la Louisiane, n'agiront jamais ensemble ; les Américains du Tennessee et du Kentucky sont ennemis jurés de l'Angleterre, et n'aspirent dans ce moment qu'à prendre possession des postes établis sur la rive gauche du Mississipi, reculer toutes les nations sauvages jusqu'au delà du fleuve pour n'avoir plus de guerre indienne à craindre et acquérir de nouvelles terres.

Les Creeks et les Cherokees ont de tout tems été les alliés et les amis de l'Espagne, ainsi que les ennemis déclarés des Américains ; un changement aussi prompt est invraisemblable.

<sup>1</sup> The letter of Chisholm to Mitchell and Major Craig inclosed in this letter of Collot is printed in *Annals of Fifth Congress*, II, 2399 ; and Collot, *Journey in North America*, II, 67 ; French edition, II, 90.

On Mitchell and Craig see Chisholm's declaration, number XIII, *post*. Mitchell had given information to the Spanish authorities at Natchez in December, 1793, concerning the plot of Genet, *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, I, 1029. See Mitchell's deposition in *Annals of Fifth Congress*, II, 2336, 2398-2399.

The text of the letter in the *Journey* varies in minor phraseology and substitutes May for July. Possibly the verbal discrepancies arise from translation. Collot's statement, in his *Journey*, II, 64-68, that he informed Gayoso at Natchez of the circumstantial details of the hostile preparations against Louisiana and that he received Chisholm's letter at that place, is impossible, since the letter bears the date March 17, 1797, and the date of Collot's stay at Natchez was in October, 1796. Collot reached Philadelphia by the beginning of January, 1797, and it was not until February 24 that Adet informed his government that the English meditated an expedition against Upper Louisiana and a descent of the Mississippi. He remarks that he had had conferences in the matter with the Spanish minister, Yrujo. That minister called the attention of the Secretary of State on February 27 to an expedition said to be planned against Spanish territory, and again, on March 2, the Spanish minister briefly mentions the Fox and Wisconsin rivers as the line of attack, and St. Louis and New Madrid as objective points (*American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, II, 68, 87-89). Chisholm was a babbler, and on March 19, according to the testimony in the Blount case, he was "vociferating vehemently amidst a crowd of Frenchmen" at a Philadelphia tavern (*Annals of Fifth Congress*, II, 2368). Possibly Collot secured his detailed evidence and the Chisholm letter and deposition at this time. Chisholm's date of sailing had been fixed for March 19, but the vessel did not depart until the next day, and Chisholm sent letters back from the Capes, including one to Blount, March 23 (*ibid.*, 2369). The date of Collot's present letter, April 15, 1797, is certainly significant. He may have desired to dignify his western inquiries by antedating this discovery. But see his account of Lorimer's disclosures (*Journey*, II, 11-13), which were probably the basis of his first reports to the French and Spanish ministers. Note the relation of this subject to the retention of the Spanish posts and to Liston's correspondence with Pickering (*American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, II, 20-103, *passim*).

Une partie des habitans des Natchès prendra sans doute volontiers les armes pour les Anglais, mais, royalistes réfugiés de la dernière guerre, ils n'agiront jamais en faveur des Américains.

Je crois fermement qu'il y a un plan de [?] formé par l'Angleterre pour attaquer la Louisiane et que ce plan est secrettement favorisé par un parti aux États-Unis ; mais les deux plans dont parle le S<sup>t</sup> Michel sont très distincts.

Les Américains du Tennessee et du Kentucky veulent avoir les postes occupés par les troupes de Sa Majesté Catholique, mais quand [quant] à présent ils n'attaqueront pas la Louisiane ; ils se battraient plutôt contre l'Angleterre. Ils ne peuvent être soutenus dans l'attaque de ces postes par aucune nation sauvage, excepté par une portion des Chikasaws, et l'on fera tourner aisément contre eux les Natchès.

Les Anglais (ou les compagnies du Canada) veulent la Louisiane et principalement la partie supérieure, pour leur commerce de pelleteries, et ils entraîneront dans cette expédition les Canadiens et les nations sauvages, en leur persuadant que c'est contre l'Espagne seule qu'ils veulent faire la guerre.

Mais mon opinion est que, d'après les mesures sages et fermes prises, il y a plus d'un mois, par le ministre de Sa Majesté Catholique près des États-Unis, en faisant passer un ingénieur à S<sup>t</sup> Louis pour mettre cette place en état de défense, et requérant le gouvernement des États-Unis, de faire respecter son territoire, il est impossible, si le gouvernement fédéral est de bonne foi et fait respecter sa neutralité, que les Anglais puissent attaquer la haute Louisiane avant l'hiver prochain ; ce qui donne à la Cour d'Espagne tout le tems nécessaire pour porter dans cette partie de sa colonie des secours suffisans pour la mettre à l'abri d'une insulte.

À l'égard du second plan d'invasion, désuni dans ses parties, M<sup>r</sup> le gouverneur de la Louisiane est encore à tems de le déconcerter par des mesures promptes, tant en faisant renforcer les peuples menacés, qu'en faisant agir près des sauvages, des Natchès et des Américains de l'ouest, des agens différens, qui sachent faire tourner au profit de Sa Majesté Catholique leurs intérêts divers, et leurs passions très distinctes.

PHILADELPHIE, le 15 avril 1797 (V. S.)

Signé, V. COLLOT.

Pour copie conforme

P. A. ADET.

IX. ROBERT LISTON TO LORD GRENVILLE.<sup>1</sup>

PHILADELPHIA 10 May 1797

*My Lord*

The project suggested by the person mentioned in my letters N<sup>o</sup> 2, 3, and 8 was of so great importance and on a consideration of the weak and neglected state of the Spanish American Settlements, appeared to be of such easy execution that I thought it my duty not to prevent His Majesty's Ministers from having an opportunity of discussing the subject with a man who (though without education or brilliant talents) seemed to be enterprising, resolute, and well acquainted with the proposed scene of action.

A circumstance has however since occurred which must add to the difficulty of carrying into effect any plan of the nature of the one in question.

Suspensions have gone abroad which I do not know how to account for, otherwise than by the indiscretion of the proposer — that the Government of Great Britain has actually an intention of attacking the Spanish possessions on the Mississippi. The idea has acquired so great a degree of consistency as to produce a representation on the subject from the Catholic King's Envoy here to the Ministers of the United States and a consequent note from Colonel Pickering to me of which last I have the honour of inclosing a copy. And, partly owing to this alarm, partly to the frequent journies of suspicious Frenchmen into the back settlements of the United States, orders have been sent by the Secretary at War to the Commanding officers of the American Garrisons on the frontiers not to permit any travellers to pass their posts or to frequent those interior parts of the Country (even though they are Citizens of the United States) except those persons who are authorised to do so by Treaty meaning the British Traders from Canada, who have a right to pass and repass freely for the sake of trade.

This regulation, if strictly put in execution, might subject the author of the project himself, were he to return to the South Western Territory, to be refused admission and perhaps to be arrested, and it would be unsafe to trust him with any papers of consequence.

I beg leave therefore to suggest to Your Lordship whether it would not be advisable in the first place to draw from him all the information he is capable of giving and then to send him back to this Country accompanied or followed by a Person in whose talents and integrity our Government could place implicit confidence, who might in the first moment travel without suspicion as a Canadian Merchant, and afterwards act as circumstances might direct.

<sup>1</sup> Public Record Office, America 18. Compare Liston's disavowals and admissions in *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, II, 69, 71. Pickering gave Rufus King, our minister to England, an account of Blount's offense July 8 and August 5, 1797 (King, *Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, II, 196–197, 209–210, incompletely published). Létombe's despatch of July 18, 1797, alleges that two of Liston's letters were subtracted at Pickering's instance from Romayne's papers (*Report of American Historical Association*, 1903, II).

It is proper I should add, however, that reports are current here, and daily gaining credit. — That the French are soon to have possession of Louisiana, and that they are already planning improvements on the fortifications and an increase of the garrisons on the banks of the Mississippi.

I have the honour to be, with the greatest respect My Lord,  
Your Lordships Most Obedient Humble Servant

ROB. LISTON

X. ROBERT LISTON TO LORD GRENVILLE.<sup>1</sup>

No. 27

PHILADELPHIA 24<sup>th</sup> June 1797

*My Lord*

I am much concerned that I did not receive Your Lordship's letter N<sup>o</sup> 6 in time to prevent M<sup>r</sup> Chisholm from setting sail for England. I have only now to request that Your Lordship will have the goodness to let him have his answer without delay and to direct him to return by the first opportunity to America both for the sake of appearances and that he may have no pretence for making claims on me for considerable sums of money for although I made him no promises of any kind yet as he had my consent to undertake the voyage I might not unnaturally find myself incommoded by his importunities on that head, were he to fall into difficulties in consequence of the protraction of his stay in London.

As the representations made to me by the American Secretary of State at the suggestion of the Spanish Minister respecting the pretended preparations on the lakes for an expedition against Upper Louisiana had in the first instance received only a verbal and preliminary answer, the rejection of the plan in question upon motives so liberal and so friendly to the United States as those alleged in Your Lordship's dispatch afforded me the means of giving Colonel Pickering an official and definitive reply I put into his hands the note I have the honour to enclose, with which he appeared to be satisfied and I hope the conversation we afterwards had on the subject will prevent him from making a disclosure which appeared to have been hastily resolved on by the American Government and which might be attended with consequences in some measure unfavourable to the cause of Great Britain without producing any real advantage to the administration of this Country.

It seems that some of the persons engaged in the project proposed to me, and communicated to Your Lordship, had been sufficiently imprudent either in consequence of intoxication, or by want of caution respecting their correspondence, to put it in the power of the American Ministers to get possession of proofs that there existed some plan of an expedition towards the Mississippi which was to originate in the Territories of the United States. The indications which had been discovered led to think that the enterprize was to be patronized by England. But Colonel Pickering has of late been so much accustomed to consider it as a fixed point that the French were to obtain possession of Louisiana, and he is

<sup>1</sup> Public Record Office, America 18.

so much persuaded that a measure immediately connected with this change of sovereignty must be an endeavour on the part of the Republick to excite disaffection and rebellion in the South Western Territories of the United States that he considered the attribution of the plan to British Agency or encouragement as a mere pretext to conceal the real springs of the operation. This idea had determined him in his present state of violent animosity against the French, to make a formal communication to the Congress of everything he had discovered; and he was the more fixed in this resolution from the circumstance that a Member of the Senate of the name of Blount (deputed by the State of Tennessee) a man of an active and turbulent character, and unfriendly to the present administration, appeared to be one of the chief promoters of the enterprize.

I have endeavoured to persuade Colonel Pickering and I flatter myself with some degree of success that a promulgation of the business in its present state would by no means be advisable. That it would furnish His Catholick Majesty's officers with a pretext for retaining the posts that were to be delivered up according to the late Treaty. That it would serve to throw an odium (however ill founded) on the British Nation which could be attended with no good effects to the Government of the United States, while on the other hand it would probably be impossible to bring home any serious charge either to French Agents or the American Citizens who were implicated in the plot. That these last might find means to exculpate themselves by pretending that they had only in view the acquisition of rich lands on the banks of the Mississippi, in the event of that Country's being possessed by people of more tolerant and liberal principles than the Spaniards, but that they intended to take no active part without the permission of their own Government which the present conduct of the Spaniards in that quarter gave them reason to suppose would sooner or later be obtained. I added that a public accusation would have the double effect of inviting<sup>1</sup> the principal characters concerned in the plan and of putting them on their guard, whereas, since the American Ministry were now possessed of a clew of discovery, they might by adopting a system of forbearance have it in their power to watch the motions of these men and to prevent all danger.

A few days will determine whether this reasoning has had its desired effect.

I have the honour to be, with greatest Respect My Lord  
Your Lordship's Most Obedient Humble Servant

ROB. LISTON

<sup>1</sup> Inciting?



XI. CHEVALIER DE YRUJO TO TIMOTHY PICKERING.<sup>1</sup>

*Mui S<sup>or</sup> mio.*

La publicacion que acaba de hacerse del Mensage secreto del Presidente de los Estados Unidos á las dos Camaras del Congreso con motivo del descubrimiento de la Carta del Senador Blount á M<sup>te</sup> Carey, me ha hecho ver con gran sentimiento lo mui fundados que eran mis temores, comunicados á V. S. por mi en varias Cartas desde el principio de Marzo ultimo, acerca de la intencion que los Ingleses tenian de atacar las Posesiones Españolas en esta parte del Continente, violando el territorio de los Estados Unidos.

La citada Carta del Coronel Blount no dexa la menor duda sobre un proyecto tán hostil; y siendo el Senador Blount no solo Ciudadano de los Estados Unidos, sino Miembro de su Gobierno, y habiendo faltado con una conducta tán criminal no solo al Rey de España mi Amo sino á los Estados Unidos, debo pedir á V. S., como lo hago ahora del modo mas serio en nombre de S. M., la satisfacci3n correspondiente por tán escandaloso delito, imponiendosele toda la pena y castigo que las Leyes del Pays dicten para crimines semejantes.

Ofrezco á V. S. mis deseos de complacerle, y de que N<sup>ro</sup> S<sup>or</sup> gñe su vida m<sup>te</sup> a<sup>te</sup>.

PHILADELPHIA 6 de Julio de 1797<sup>2</sup>

Q. B. S. M<sup>te</sup> de V. S.

su mas at<sup>te</sup> y seg<sup>o</sup> Serv<sup>or</sup>

CARLOS M<sup>te</sup>RIÑZ DE YRUJO

S<sup>or</sup> D<sup>na</sup> Timoteo Pikerling —

[*Indorsement*.:] Chev. de Yrujo 6 July 1797. rec<sup>d</sup> 7. congratulatory on discovery of Blount's plot, and requesting he may be punished according to the laws of the US.

<sup>1</sup> Department of State, Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Notes to Department, Spain, volume I. In the letter of Pickering to Yrujo, August 8, 1797 Pickering says of this letter: "But it is well known that Mr. Blount was your frequent guest and intimate companion, and that he was on this intimate footing with you during the whole time that you were representing to the Government your suspicions of British expeditions. Yet, after the discovery of the conspiracy was made public, you formally requested the American Government to punish him for so scandalous a crime. But seeing Mr. Blount was a citizen of the United States, and not a subject of Spain, it would have been decent in you to have left him with his own Government without interposing your advice. But especially when you knew that the President had laid his letter before Congress, and the two Houses were deliberating on the modes of punishing him; when the investigation had proceeded so far that a committee of the Senate had reported a resolution to expel Mr. Blount from the Senate, and a committee of the House had reported a resolution that he should be impeached for high crimes and misdemeanors: for you then to interfere was singularly improper; and it was such an ostentatious display of zeal as, under all the known circumstances, suggests more than one interpretation." *Annals of Fifth Congress*, III, 3218.

<sup>2</sup> On July 11 Yrujo wrote again to Pickering; the letter is published *ibid.*, 3154-3162. In writing to Rufus King, August 5, 1797 (letter published in extract in King, *Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, II, 209-210), Pickering says: "I inclose a letter from the Spanish Minister, the Chevalier de Yrujo to me, dated the 11<sup>th</sup> Ult. His

(TRANSLATION)

Sir,

The publication lately made of the secret message from the President of the United States to both Houses of Congress on the discovery of the letter from Senator Blount to M<sup>r</sup> Carey, has caused me to feel with great emotion how well founded were my fears communicated to you by my sundry letters from the first of March last relative to the intention which the English had to attack the Spanish possessions in that part of the Continent, by violating the territory of the US.

The said letter from Colonel Blount does not leave the least doubt on so hostile a project ; and Senator Blount being not only a citizen of the US. but a member of its Government, and having failed in so criminal a piece of conduct, not only the King of Spain my master but the US. should request from you,<sup>1</sup> as I now do in the most serious manner in the name of His Majesty, a satisfaction proportioned to so scandalous a crime, by inflicting on him all the pains and punishments which the laws of the Country dictate for such crimes.

Professing my wishes to serve you, and that God may preserve your life many years

I am sir, your most ob<sup>d</sup> serv<sup>t</sup>

CARLOS M. DE YRUJO

PHILA<sup>a</sup> July 6. 1797.

Timothy Pickering Esq<sup>r</sup>

## XII. ROBERT LISTON TO [LORD GRENVILLE].<sup>2</sup>

PHILADELPHIA 8 July 1797

*My Lord*

The *proofs* alluded to in my letter N<sup>o</sup> 27 of the Existence of a plan concerted by certain inhabitants of the United States for an attack on the Spanish territories in North America in favour of Great Britain, con-

statements are as erroneous and his reasoning as feeble, as his stile and expressions are rude and unbecoming a diplomatic Character. My other engagements have been two [*sic*] numerous and too urgent hitherto to write him an answer. Two or three days since I began an examination of it, and shall finish it as soon as more important business will permit. This answer perhaps the President may lay before Congress at the next Session; and in that case it may be published. [See *Annals of Fifth Congress*, III, 3199-3219, for Pickering to Yrujo, August 8, 1797, his answer to Yrujo's letter of July 11.] The Spanish Minister procured M<sup>r</sup> Bache to print the inclosed pamphlet containing his letter, and also sent it to the Editor of Porcupine's Gazette for publication; by the time that I had got the original translated. The Editor commented on the letter, and made remarks on the Minister, his Nation, and the King of Spain, in such terms as induced the Minister formally to request a prosecution against him; which in deference to his Catholic Majesty, the President thought fit to direct."

<sup>1</sup> This passage should of course read, "and having been at fault in a proceeding so criminal not only toward the king of Spain, my master, but also toward the United States, I must ask of you", etc. A letter of Yrujo to Pickering, May 24, 1797, complains of the inexact translations published by the Department of State, *Annals of Fifth Congress*, III, 3082-3083.

<sup>2</sup> Public Record Office, America 18.

sisted of an intercepted letter written by M<sup>r</sup>. William Blount (formerly Governor of the district of Tennessee, and lately elected Senator for that New State) directed to a person of the name of Carey, an Indian interpreter in the pay of the United States residing in the South Western Settlements of this Country

In this letter M<sup>r</sup>. Blount unbosoms himself without reserve on the subject of the project suggested to me through Captain Chisholm [(]in which it appears that he expected to sustain a principal part) and he instructs his friend to contribute towards the success of the plan by endeavouring to secure the co-operation of the Indians, and in particular to increase his (Blount's) interest and consequence among them without any regard to the delicacy of the means to be employed.<sup>1</sup>

It was—from the first moment that the matter was mentioned to me—and it still is my opinion that it would have been more consistent with the dignity, the tranquility, and the real interest of the American Government to have suppressed all mention of this discovery—and I had flattered myself that I had brought over Colonel Pickering to the same sentiments. But the business struck the President in a different light. He looked forward to the possible explosion of the plot by other means and to the blame that might eventually fall on him for throwing a veil over a project calculated to favour a nation towards whom his enemies already accuse him of entertaining a culpable partiality. And the administration no doubt thought that the disgrace of a man who had been vehemently opposed to the measures of Government would have some effect in humbling and weakening the democratic party in general. M<sup>r</sup>. Adams therefore resolved to communicate the business together with other matters in a confidential message to the two Houses of Congress and to leave them to take such measures on the occasion as they might think expedient.

I have the honour of enclosing a printed Copy of that Message with the documents referred to which relate chiefly to the increasing difficulties that have arisen respecting the surrender of the Spanish posts on the frontiers and to the danger of an Indian war. The letter of Governor Blount is No XVIII the last in the Collection.

The Secretary of State gave me an opportunity by the enclosed correspondence<sup>2</sup> of exculpating myself and the British Government of any degree of blame in this business. I have stated to Colonel Pickering with perfect truth that I had assured the speculators who applied to me here *that I could give no encouragement to the plan*. The fact is that although I did not chuse to take upon me to reject altogether an idea of such importance, and which I believe the United States themselves would have been glad to see carried into execution, if it could have been effected

<sup>1</sup> See the letter in *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, II, 76-77. It is dated April 21, 1797, and was communicated to Congress by the President July 3, 1797.

<sup>2</sup> See *ibid.*, 69-71.

with a rapid success, — yet I felt all the difficulty and danger of the enterprise which I stated to Captain Chisholm with more force than I have expressed in my reports on the subject to Your Lordship and it was with no small reluctance that I yielded at last to his earnest intreaties to be allowed to make a journey to Europe.

The violent partisans of the democratick faction, who have since my arrival at Philadelphia observed with regret my anxious endeavour to promote a good understanding between Great Britain and America, and the degree of success with which they have been attended, were eager, on the first indistinct report which was spread respecting this business, to asperse my character, and Calumniate my intentions with regard to this Country and they shewed an inclination to carry their enmity to all possible lengths on the occasion. The explanations I have given appear, however to be generally considered as satisfactory and if any unfavourable impression has been made by the first aspect of the affair there is reason to hope it will be equally slight and transitory.

It is singular enough that Governor Blount is a man whom I have never seen and with whom I have had no communication either direct or circuitous. I did not even know till I read his letter that he was one of the persons concerned in the plan. M<sup>r</sup> Chisholm used to mention him as a man of weight and influence in the back Country whom it would be essential to gain but he seemed to doubt the possibility of securing him.

It also appears from Blount's letters that there has been a branch of the project with which I have not been acquainted for I have no knowledge of the *man of consequence* who is said to *have gone to England*. At all events it is evident that the idea must now be wholly renounced unless the United States should come to a breach with the Court of Spain of which indeed there seems to be some degree of probability.

I cannot conclude without observing with regret that there is a degree of disingenuity and a disposition to intrigue and chicanery in the conduct of M. Yrujo the Spanish Minister in this Country which is highly disagreeable and may become dangerous to us. He has already produced in the most formal way a pretended plan for an expedition from Canada which never had existence. He now talks with perfect assurance of certain offers made by the English to a General Clarke in Georgia, which I conceive to be equally destitute of foundation; and I understand he is proceeding to bring forward other heads of accusation more gross and equally groundless, which are unfortunately received with pleasure and perhaps with sincere belief by the malignant or ill informed supporters of the French and Democratick parties in the United Kingdom

I have the honour to be with the greatest Respect

My Lord, Your Lordships, Most Obedient Humble Servant  
ROB. LISTON

XIII. STATEMENT OF CHISHOLM TO RUFUS KING.

The Declaration of John D. Chisholm.<sup>1</sup>

I arrived in New York while the British Army were in possession of it;—having a Father residing in Charleston South Carolina, I went to him in the year one thousand seven hundred and seventy seven. I went from thence a few months after my arrival in Charleston to Savannah in Georgia, remained there a few weeks; from thence I proceeded to St Augustine, remained there about two weeks, and from thence I proceeded to Pensacola; there I continued until the Spaniards took possession of the Country, I think in the same year or early in the year one thousand seven hundred and seventy eight; from thence I was obliged to fly to the Indian Country where I found Protection from Alexander Mc Gill-veray and others. I remained in the Creek Nation about three months, then went to the Cherokee Nation, and remained there a few weeks when I got acquainted with one Roach, Harling, and other Indian Traders from the Frontiers of the United States; with them I came into that part of the Country called then the Settlement of Holstien, now the State of Tennessee, from hence I traded with the Indians and often went to them from the Inhabitants to ask for Prisoners; in this way I continued till Colonel William Blount was appointed Governor of that State. I established a permanent Home at Knoxville where I was employed by Colonel Blount, the first time was to bring Goods for the Treaty of Holstien, and afterwards to bring the Indians to said Treaty, and continued to act for him on many occasions carrying Indians to and from Philadelphia; the last time in taking the Indians to Philadelphia, and in the month of November<sup>2</sup> 1796 arrived there—At this period I brought with me to Philadelphia a Petition from British Subjects residing in the Indian Nations, signed by myself and (I think) about twenty five others, requesting to be admitted Citizens of the United States; this Petition I presented to the Honorable James McHenry Secretary at War who treated it with coolness and said he would refer it to M<sup>r</sup> Hawkins who had been appointed Superintendant of Indian affairs—I had conceived myself entitled to some notice and employment under the United States from the Services I had rendered in consequence of my influence with the

<sup>1</sup> Department of State, Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Despatches, England, volume 5. For Chisholm's personal traits see the evidence in Blount's trial, particularly *Annals of Fifth Congress*, II, 2357, 2366-2368. "He was a hardy, lusty, brawny, weather-beaten man", given to drink and brag. It is important to read this document in connection with the explanations and additional information in King, *Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, II, 217-218, 253-258. King's letter of October 31, 1797 (*ibid.*, 236-237), gives an ingenious conjecture of a connection between Romaine, Yrujo, Las Casas, De Moustier, and Blount in a western land speculation. Liston's relation to the Pulteney land speculations in the Genesee country, and Dr. Romaine's connection with Sir William Pulteney are shown by other documents.

<sup>2</sup> According to John Franklin (see *Annals of Fifth Congress*, II, 2380-2381), Chisholm stopped at George Leshner's tavern, 94 North Second street, Philadelphia, with about twenty-two Cherokee Indians. Rogers and Carey were also there. For particulars see text cited.

Indians, and had very frequent promises from Colonel Blount to that effect. At the time I left the Indian Country with this Petition which was the Twenty first day of September one thousand seven hundred and ninety six, the signers to this Petition, with myself and the principal Chiefs who accompanied me to Philadelphia had come to the determination that in case the same or similar Protection and Encouragement was not given them to that they received under the British Government they had formed a Plan to attack the Spanish Settlements, namely the Province of West Florida and Louisiana: Finding our Prospects not to our wishes in Philadelphia, I applied to M<sup>r</sup> Liston the British Minister (I think about the latter end of November 1796) and laid open to him the plan verbally; he answered that he would take it into consideration and give me an answer at a given day; three or four days afterwards I called upon him, according to appointment, and he informed me that he had no Powers to go into a business of this kind; that he had objections to it on account of the Indians being engaged in it; that it was objectionable also on account of the neutrality of the United States. — I had frequent interviews with him afterwards in one of which he said that if I would deliver him the Plan he would send it to his own Government. I delivered him the Plan in writing without mentioning any of my American connexions. — I waited for some Months, that is from November till March, when being tired of waiting longer, I determined on coming to England; this determination I communicated to M<sup>r</sup> Liston<sup>1</sup> and asked him to give me Letters to this Country; he accordingly gave me Letters to Lord Grenville, M<sup>r</sup> Dundas and M<sup>r</sup> Hammond<sup>2</sup> saying “that the Bearer was the person mentioned in former Letters etc.” — this I think was nearly the purport of them which he shewed me before they were sealed; he also gave me another Letter to some person concerned in the East India Company sealed, which I suppose was of a private nature; the persons name I do not recollect. — M<sup>r</sup> Liston also gave me a Letter to a M<sup>r</sup> Gavett<sup>3</sup> of Hamburgh at my own instance, in case I was taken by the French to act as a blind or as a Letter of Introduction as occasion might occur.<sup>4</sup> On my arrival in England I delivered the Letters to Lord Grenville, M<sup>r</sup> Dundas and M<sup>r</sup> Hammond at Lord Grenville’s Office; three or four days after this I received a Note from the Secretary of M<sup>r</sup> Dundas requesting me to call at that Office. I called and was informed that I must state my Propositions in writing which I did a few days afterwards and they were in substance nearly the same as those delivered to M<sup>r</sup> Liston with the addition of the many Friends to the Plan, Citizens of the United States, but I did not mention names; I had a copy of it where I formerly lodged which shall be forthcoming if in my power. — After remaining here about six or eight weeks and calling frequently at

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, 2352.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 2368.

<sup>3</sup> J. H. Goverts; letter in King, *Correspondence*, II, 198.

<sup>4</sup> *Annals of Fifth Congress*, II, 2367.

Lord Grenville's Office, I was at length informed that the Government declined going into the business<sup>1</sup>; a Draft was delivered me for One hundred Pounds to pay my expences back to America and a Pass (by my Request) which is in the French Language, to return to America. After my arrival in Philadelphia in November One thousand seven hundred and ninety six, I communicated the Plan to Colonel William Blount who immediately agreed to give it all his aid and influence; I saw him frequently afterwards at his House in Chesnut Street and talked with him on the business; I communicated the matter also to a M<sup>r</sup> Ingraham who lodged at the same house with me (Lasher's<sup>2</sup> Tavern N<sup>o</sup> 92 North Second Street) who said he was a British Subject, and through him I was introduced to a certain Lewis Collins<sup>3</sup> a person said to be concerned in the Stages; this last Man as well as the other agreed to give the Plan their assistance, and he (Collins) said that he would go to Boston where he could raise One hundred stout Yankees and would load two Vessels with Provisions and take them round to the Floridas and join me; I then promised him that on those Conditions he should be appointed a Commissary and also have Commissions for himself and his friends; I left him in Philadelphia, and have heard nothing of him or Ingraham since I left Philadelphia I think in the month of January one thousand seven hundred and ninety seven and proceeded to New York in company with Captain John Rodgers formerly a Captain in the British Army, James Cary Indian Interpreter, four Creek and four Cherokee Chiefs, and took up my Lodgings at James Bradleys N<sup>o</sup> 1. Gold Street where I became acquainted with a M<sup>r</sup> Nicholas<sup>4</sup> and a M<sup>r</sup> Morris who I found was a British Subject from Kingston Jamaica, and had gone there on some Mercantile business; Nicholas I think said he was from New Haven; they both approved of the Plan. Morris said that if I succeeded with the British Government, he would assist all in his power by advancing Money on my Drafts in the West Indies or otherwise and Nicholas said that he would assist in providing Vessels to carry ammunition etc<sup>a</sup>; while in New York I also became acquainted with a certain John Mitchell<sup>5</sup> who I understood was a Surveyor and largely concerned in Land Speculations and who I found had a good knowledge of the Country, particularly the Upper Spanish Posts on the Mississippi; this man came to me in Philadelphia and gave me to understand that he had heard from my Friends Morris and Nicholas our Plan. After several interviews in which he pointed out that he could be of material service, I agreed with him that if we succeeded with the British Government he should be commissioned; in one of our interviews he proposed a certain

<sup>1</sup> King, *Correspondence*, II, 218.

<sup>2</sup> Lasher.

<sup>3</sup> Captain Collins of Marblehead, Massachusetts, King, *Correspondence*, II, 255.

<sup>4</sup> A ship-owner of New Haven, who sent vessels to New Orleans, *ibid*.

<sup>5</sup> See answer to question 19, p. 604. Compare *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, I, 1027, 1029; King, *Correspondence*, II, 255; Collot, *Journey*, II, 67; and Collot's letter of April 15, 1797, number VIII, *ante*, pp. 585-587.



Major Craig formerly of the American Army, and who I understood lived about thirty or forty miles from Philadelphia (he was a stout man of about Six feet high about forty or perhaps forty five years of age) Mitchell often brought Craig to see me but I always evaded talking with him on the Subject; however I told Mitchell that as I had confidence in him he might promise to Craig that he should be employed; about the month of February last a certain Colonel James Orr of the State of Tennessee came to Philadelphia who I had known before and who lodged in the same house with me; in the course of conversation I informed him of our Plan to which he gave his hearty concurrence, and said that he could procure as many Men in his own State as he pleased and that he could be joined by Colonel Whiteley with a thousand Men from Kentucky *if I said the word*, as they always understood each other.<sup>1</sup> — While I was in the Indian Country in the Summer of ninety six I wrote by direction of the Indian Chiefs Circular Letters respecting the Peace which was expected to take place between them and the United States. Among these were Letters sent to the Kings and Chiefs of the Northern Tribes; Brandt and Cornplanter arrived too late for the Treaty, accompanied by Captain Johnston, Captain Stedman,<sup>2</sup> M<sup>r</sup> Street (a Member of Assembly for Upper Canada) and a M<sup>r</sup> Joseph Smith<sup>3</sup> Indian Interpreter for the United States (Johnston and Stedman are both from Canada) I communicated to all those Persons, except Smith who we were afraid to trust; and all agreed to give their aid excepting Cornplanter who observed that as he was now surrounded by White People he wanted to learn his People to live at peace, but if any of his young men chose to follow his Friend, alluding to Brandt he could not prevent them. Afterwards I wrote Brandt and Johnston that I had embarked for England and they should hear from me — I also communicated at Philadelphia the plan to a M<sup>r</sup> John Hilsman a Merchant in Knoxville who had come to Philadelphia (in March last) by him I sent Letters to my friends with the English and Spanish Declarations of war the Treaty between the United States and Spain and said that “they would hold themselves in readiness till they should see me” — I sent about fifty of the Declarations under cover to Captain John Rogers who was then with the Cherokee Nation and who was to deliver them to the different Persons who signed the Petition to the Americans mentioned in the first part of this Declaration and whose names as far as I can recollect are John M<sup>r</sup> Daniel, James Lesslie, Joseph Higgins, Robert Grason, John Clark, Daniel M<sup>r</sup> Gillveray, John O’Kelly, William Thompson, Malcolm M<sup>r</sup> Gee, James Kemp (M<sup>r</sup> Daniels’ name was not to the Petition); however the Petition which is with the Secretary of war will speak for itself as to Signatures; but as very many of them knew nothing of our Plan I will mention the names of those who did know it and who

<sup>1</sup> See King, *Correspondence*, II, 255.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

agreed to give their aid — Daniel M<sup>c</sup>Gillveray, James Lesslie, Joseph Higgins, Robert Grayson, John Clark, John O'Kelly, William Thompson, Malcolm M<sup>c</sup> Gee, James Kemp, John O'Rietty, Francis Lesslie, John Steel; all those persons I have conferred with myself on the business, also with James Colbert — Cap<sup>t</sup> Rodgers who I have already mentioned, informed me that he had mentioned the plan to a certain Spaniard (whose name I do not at present recollect) who had run from the Spanish Garrison at Pensacola and taken refuge among the Indians; he had been employed as a Rider and Interpreter by the Spaniards and spoke all the Indian Languages. — I think his name is Antonio Gomaza or something like it. I have often seen him and we used to call him *Tonio*; however I know him to be the Identical Person who the Spaniards sent into the Indian Country in ninety five with Letters to the Indian Chiefs of the Chicksaws and Choptaws requesting them to make Peace with the Creek Nation; the reason of Rodgers' mentioning their Plan to the Spaniard was I suppose in consequence of his belief that he would now assist them, as he had deserted from the Spaniards, and indeed he agreed to join in it — this Captain Rogers came to Philadelphia with me in November ninety six, as an Interpreter, and was brought at the Instigation of the Dogwere<sup>1</sup> the King of the Creek Nation and myself, and is very friendly to the United States; There also came with me to Philadelphia, Malcolm M<sup>c</sup>Gee formerly British Interpreter and John Pitchlen who were both acquainted with and were to join in the plan — there was a certain person named Cobb who resided at the Natchez who came into the Indian Country, and I have been well informed that he was acquainted with the plan from some quarter. I recollect meeting at Philadelphia with a Person who called himself Blackburn to whom I mentioned the Plan; he said at first that he should have no objection to join in it provided the United States were concerned, but damned the British having any thing to do in it; he was well acquainted with Blount, as he informed me, and afterwards he said to me if you go on with your Plan I intend to join you; he resides in Richmond in Virginia as he said — the last time I saw Colonel Blount was sometime in March last previous to my sailing from America which was the Twenty first day of that month<sup>2</sup>; he said to me that he wanted me to be gone into the Indian Country and mind the business there; that he had been in New York, and while there had communicated with Doctor Romain<sup>3</sup> and that they had agreed to carry

<sup>1</sup> Dog Warrior, of the Natchez?

<sup>2</sup> See *Annals of Fifth Congress*, II, 2367-2369.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Nicholas Romaine, who figures prominently in the documents printed in connection with the trial of Blount, was in London in March, 1796, where Liston made his acquaintance. Liston gave Pickering an account of his relations with Romaine to show that they were free from an intrigue (Pickering papers, in the Massachusetts Historical Society, Pickering's statement of July 26, 1797, VI, 467; see also VII, 93). There is, however, evidence in the Chatham papers that Romaine had been an agent of the British government. It is probable that additional material exists in the Public Record Office regarding the connection of Liston and Chisholm.

on the plan on a much larger Scale than I had contemplated<sup>1</sup>; and added that if it took place he must be well paid for it, or he must make large sacrifices in America — At the time I held a talk with the Indians in ninety five by directions of Blount there was a French Man there at the same time sent by the Governor of Pensacola (as he said); his name was John Louis Treville or Trevill; I had no conversation with him as I did not speak Spanish or French, and he did not speak English — I arrived in this Country in the Ship John Henderson; there were no other Passengers on board, except a certain Charles Jacob Hetter<sup>2</sup> from Lancaster Pennsylvania and a Woman. I never mentioned the plan to Hetter; he once asked me since I arrived whether I was concerned in a plan with Blount, and brought me the American Papers giving an account of Blounts Conduct — I could be more particular of names and other matters respecting the Spanish Garrisons was I in a situation to have access to my Papers which are in a small Trunk which I left in Philadelphia in the House of Mr Liston under the care of Mr Thornton his Secretary — I shall be willing to make Oath when required to the truth of the foregoing and answer any Questions which may be put to me respecting this business, and have made this Declaration in presence of Major David Lenox. — On being asked a question by Major Lenox I answer that in the winter of ninety five I met a person of the name of Fulton<sup>3</sup> (who told me that he was a Colonel of Horse in the French Service) between the Towns of the Creek and the Cherokee Nations, he told me that he had come from France in order to get the Indians Consent for the establishment of a Republic in the Floridas as they the French were to take it or to get it (I don't recollect which) from the Spaniards; as I was friendly to the United States I advised him to leave the Country as soon as possible which I believe he did, as I have not heard of him since; the said Fulton is a tall handsome man, upwards of Six feet high, well mounted and handsomely equipped in every particular, appeared to be about twenty five years of age.

LONDON 29<sup>th</sup> November 1797.

JOHN D CHISHOLM

#### XIV. OUTLINE OF CHISHOLM'S PLAN.

The General Outlines of the Plan referred to in my Declaration of the Twenty ninth day of November one thousand seven hundred and ninety seven, were as follows.<sup>4</sup> —

Brant and his Associates were to be joined at an agreed point on the Ohio by Mitchell and Craig with such men as they should have collected on the Frontiers of New York and Pennsylvania — this Party were to at-

<sup>1</sup> *Annals of Fifth Congress*, II, 2356–2355, especially the important conversation on p. 2358.

<sup>2</sup> Christian Jacob Huetter; see *ibid.*, 2367; King, *Correspondence*, II, 217–218.

<sup>3</sup> *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, X, 270.

<sup>4</sup> Compare Collot's letter of April 15, 1797, number VIII, *ante*, and *Journey*, II, 65–66, and George Rogers Clark's letter of March 2, 1797 (Baron Marc de Villiers du Terrage, *Les Dernières Années de la Louisiane Française*, 362–363).

tack New Madrid, leave a Garrison in it, and proceed to the Head of the Red River and take possession of the Silver Mines. Mitchell and Craig with their Associates were to descend the Ohio in the character of Traders.

The People of Tennessee, Whitley's Men from Kentucky, with those of the Natchez and the Choctaws were to attack New Orleans; no precise arrangement was made concerning the Command of this Party; but I suppose it would be headed by Blount.

The Cherokees and Creeks with the white men of Florida, who were to join, were, under my Command, to take Pensacola; the attack on New Madrid, New Orleans and Pensacola to be made on the same day.

We made no arrangement concerning East Florida, conceiving that it would fall of course after we had obtained Possession of West Florida.

My demand of Great Britain was their Countenance of my Plan and a moderate advance of money; — that a naval force of Six frigates should be sent to block up the Harbour of Pensacola,<sup>1</sup> and the Mouth of the Mississippi; that British Commissions should be given to me and the Persons engaged in the expedition; — in case of success that the Floridas with Louisiana should be put upon the antient footing of a British Colony; — that I should be employed as the British Superintendant of Indian affairs; that public money and personal property should be equally divided between the Crown and the Captors; — that each private Soldier should receive from the Crown a grant of a thousand acres of Land; that Pensacola and New Orleans should be declared free Ports, and the navigation of Mississippi should for ever remain free to the People of Great Britain, and the United States. — We had no intention of attacking the Spanish Ports within the Territory of the United States. —

JOHN D CHISHOLM

XV. REPORT OF EXAMINATION OF CHISHOLM BY RUFUS KING.

Questions proposed by Rufus King and Answered by John D. Chisholm, — at the House and in the presence of Major David Lenox, on the Fifth day of December one thousand seven hundred and ninety seven.

Question 1<sup>st</sup> Did you communicate your plan to Blount before or after communicating it to Liston; if before was Blount privy to your communication of it to Liston?

Answer. I communicated the Plan first to Blount — Soon after I came to Philadelphia I told him that unless I succeeded as to myself and friends in our Expectations from the United States which I communicated to him that we had resolved to apply to the British Government to which Blount answered that we were perfectly right. — After I found that my Petition delivered to the Secretary of War was coldly received I informed Blount of my determination to apply to M<sup>r</sup> Liston which he approved and agreed to support the Plan.

<sup>1</sup> Létombe, July 18, 1797, takes it as being generally known that Admiral Reckett, who was just then cruising at the mouth of the Mississippi, would lead the attack in the south, while General Simcoe would be at the head of operations in the north.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. X.—39.

Question 2. Was Blount present at any Conference between you and Liston?

Answer. No, he never was present at any such Conference; it was not my practice on any occasion to converse concerning my Plan with two Persons at the same time — No person was ever present at any Conference between me and Liston.

Question 3. In what manner did Liston receive your Plan?

Answer. He objected to it on two grounds; one that it proposed the Employment of the Indians, and the other that it might affect the neutrality of the United States.

Question 4. Did you inform Liston that Blount was privy to or engaged in the Plan?

Answer. I never named Blount or any other Citizen of the United States to Liston; but I gave him to understand that some persons in Office under them would support and join in the Plan.

Question 5. What part did you suppose the Government of the United States would take in case your plan was attempted?

Answer. I supposed that they would talk, but not act, against us.

Question 6. Had you any expectation of support from any other person besides Blount in the Government of the United States?

Answer. I thought it probable, tho' I never had any conversation upon the Subject with any Member of Congress except Blount, that some of the Members who owned Lands on the Western Waters, would favor my plan — I founded this opinion on the belief that they would follow their interest which would be advanced by clearing the navigation of the Mississippi, and making New Orleans and Pensacola free Ports; — these points, being part of my plan, we supposed would influence the Frontier People to join us.

Question 7. Do you know whether Blount communicated the Plan to any person except Romaine?

Answer. I do not know that he did; he once said to me that he must be well paid by the British and added that if his Brothers knew the plan they would forsake him for ever. My conversations with Blount were always private, and without witnesses; but he one day sent his little Son to ask me to come to his House in the Evening. — On my coming into the room instead of finding him alone as usual I found M<sup>r</sup> Jefferson and General Wilkinson at Table with him (it being after Dinner) It immediately struck me, but I might have been wrong, that Blount had sent for me in order to open my Plan to these Gentlemen — this I did not incline to do, and after sitting a few Minutes, made an excuse to go away by saying that I had an appointment with the Secretary of War; and tho' Blount urged me to stay I went away.

Question 8. What objection had you to have opened your Plan to M<sup>r</sup> Jefferson and General Wilkinson, had Blount desired it?

Answer. As both these Characters were in high Offices, I did not know but Blount might intend to entrap me, and I therefore determined

in case he wished them to know the plan, that he should disclose it himself

Question 9 Had you any expectation of assistance from any Officer in the American Army?

Answer No, — I sought on several occasions to sound some of the Officers who were in Philadelphia, but I never found an opening to mention my Plan to any one of them.

Question 10. Did Orr, named in the Declaration, know that Blount was engaged in the plan?

Answer He might have known it from Blount, but did not from me.

Question 11. What was the object of your Journey to New York?

Answer Merely to gratify the Indians, who desired to see the other City, and who had also heard that they could obtain there better wampum than at Philadelphia

Question 12. What was the Object of the Circular Letters to the Northern Indians?

Answer. To invite them to attend at Philadelphia to witness the Peace; and in case we concluded to undertake my Plan, to engage them to co-operate.

Question 13. Did you communicate the Plan to the Indians sent from the several Tribes to meet you at Philadelphia, and if so did they engage to join you?

Answer. I did communicate it to them all, and they all, except the Corn Planter, engaged to join us.

Question 14. Did Liston know that Brandt and his Canada Associates were consulted, and that they had engaged?

Answer I never mentioned it to Liston, nor do I know that he knew it — Brant was with Liston more than once, but I do not know what passed on these occasions.

Question 15. Had Brant and his Associates arrived at Philadelphia before you went to New York?

Answer No. They had not arrived.

Question 16. By whom and how did you send your Letters from New York to Brant?

Answer. By a man whose name was Cozins or Cummins who knew nothing of my Plan nor of the Contents of my Letters, but who being bound to Canada engaged to forward my Letters from Albany.

Question 17. Had Blount any knowledge of your intention to come to England?

Answer. I had suspected and especially after Blount had told me that he and Romaine had agreed to carry on the Plan on a much larger Scale, that Blount wished to throw me aside. I therefore did not let him know of my determination to come to England.<sup>1</sup>

Question 18. Did you ever see or converse with Romaine?

<sup>1</sup> See *Annals of Fifth Congress*, II, 2359; *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, II, 76.

- Answer I knew Romaine four years ago in New York, and then conversed much with him, and at his request gave him a Description which he wrote down of the Western Country with which I was acquainted. — I saw him when I was last at New York, but I never conversed with him respecting my Plan
- Question 19. Was Mitchell, with whom you became acquainted at New York, named *John*?
- Answer He told me his name was John — he was a New England man who was a Surveyor, and had been at New Orleans.
- Question 20. Did you know d'Yrujo the Spanish Minister?
- Answer. Yes. I did know him.
- Question 21. Where did you ever meet him?
- Answer. At Kidds, a Lodging House near the President's, where I went to see M<sup>r</sup> Blackburn mentioned in my Declaration.
- Question 22. Had D'Yrujo any knowledge of your Plan?
- Answer. I do not know that he had.
- Question 23. Had you no fears that he would discover it?
- Answer. No, for I did not think much of his understanding.
- Question 24. Had you any intention to ask the assistance of the French; or had you any reason to think that your Plan was known by the French agents in America?
- Answer. I never intended to have any thing to do with the French, and I have no reason to believe that they knew any thing about the Plan.
- Question 25. What part did you suppose the people of Georgia and South Carolina would take in regard to your Plan?
- Answer. I supposed that the Frontier People would generally join in.
- Quest<sup>n</sup> 26. Was Blount privy to your engaging Brant and the Canadians? — Did he ever see Brant or Street?
- Answer. At Blounts request I one Evening carried Brant and the Corn Planter to his House, but we did not speak of our plan. Blount knew from me that Brant and his Associates were engaged in the Plan.
- Question 27. What has been your Treatment in England?
- Answer. I brought Letters to M<sup>r</sup> Dundas and Lord Grenville and M<sup>r</sup> Hammond and M<sup>r</sup> Moor — I have never seen either Lord Grenville or M<sup>r</sup> Dundas. — After going to Lord Grenvilles Office many times, I was finally informed by Moor one of his Clerks that the British Government would not adopt my Plan, and that Lord Grenville had ordered me to be paid One hundred Pounds to enable me to return. I said I had expended Two thousand five Hundred Dollars, and that the One Hundred Pounds would not get me home again — Moor replied that that was all he had been authorized to pay me — I said then it must be so — After this Conversation M<sup>r</sup> Moor sent me Twenty five Pounds more.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>See *Annals of Fifth Congress*, II, 2369-2370; King, *Correspondence*, II 216-218, 253-256.



Question 28.— Have you been able to recover the copy of the Plan mentioned in your declaration as having been given in by you to the British Government?

Answer. No, The person in whose hands I left it, destroyed it upon the Publication in the English Papers of Blounts Letter to Carey.

Question 29. Did Liston encourage your coming to England or advance you money for your passage?

Answer. He advised me to wait till he received an answer, but finding me resolved on coming to England he consented, but he never advanced to me any money

JOHN D CHISHOLM

XVI. AFFIDAVIT OF RUFUS KING.

LONDON December 9<sup>th</sup>, 1797.—This Day John D. Chisholm made Solemn Oath to the truth of the foregoing, Declaration, dated the twenty ninth day of November one thousand seven hundred and ninety seven ; to the truth of the Paper called the General Outlines of his Plan ; and likewise to the truth of the Answers by him made to the foregoing Twenty nine Interrogatories, all which are by him Subscribed with his name, Before me

RUFUS KING Min. plenip. of the U S. of Amer: to Great-Britain

XVII. ROBERT LISTON TO LORD GRENVILLE.<sup>1</sup>

PHILADELPHIA 5 December 1797

[Extract.]

The Committee of the House of Representatives appointed towards the close of the last Session to draw up articles of impeachment against M<sup>r</sup> Blount and to call for persons, papers, and records made their report yesterday, which with the documents accompanying it has been read in the House and is ordered to be printed. Although the report with the accompanying papers is voluminous, little additional light has been thrown upon this transaction, and as the plans of the parties concerned were never brought into action it is not probable that any further discoveries can be made

From the beginning it appears that M. de Yrujo has been indefatigable in his exertions to discover any circumstances which might serve to implicate His Majesty's Minister or the American Secretary of State, and he has not only on several occasions sent persons to the Committee (whose evidence has been contradicted in the most essential particulars) but he has corresponded (and sometimes there is room to suspect anonymously) with that body.

Whatever may be his motives of personal resentment against M<sup>r</sup> Liston (it is not difficult to find the causes of his animosity and revenge against Colonel Pickering) his efforts have been totally without effect. And I humbly beg leave to offer to Your Lordship my opinion that (put-

<sup>1</sup>No. 56, Public Record Office, America 18.

ting out of the question the impossibility of bringing any charge against M<sup>r</sup> Liston) this is to be in a great degree ascribed to his frank and well timed communication to the Secretary of State. Every circumstance which however innocent in itself, might if left to the common course of discovery have been considered as decisive proof, had been so happily anticipated by him that Colonel Pickering's opinion of his sincerity was unchangeably fixed and the views of those members of the Committee whose democratic principles might dispose them to triumph in any discovery of this kind, were compleatly defeated.

It is not much to be apprehended that these communications which the circumstances of the time and the country rendered necessary will be drawn into precedent on any future occasion and although Colonel Pickering by confessing the delicacy of the question he was about to put made an implied acknowledgement that an answer might be refused with propriety, yet M<sup>r</sup> Liston has omitted no opportunity of impressing this observation on his mind

XVIII. EDWARD THORNTON TO LORD GRENVILLE.<sup>1</sup>

PHILADELPHIA 28 December 1797

*My Lord*

M<sup>r</sup> Liston not having yet returned from his excursion to the Southward, I have the honour of transmitting to your Lordship a printed copy of the report with the accompanying documents of the Committee appointed to prepare articles of impeachment against M<sup>r</sup> Blount. It is probable that the business will rest here as M<sup>r</sup> Blount has not made his appearance conformably to the recognizances into which he was obliged to enter at the conclusion of the late Session, and it seems the general opinion that no prosecution can be carried on against him in his absence.

The letter of General Clarke<sup>2</sup> to the Spanish Consul at Charleston is perhaps the only material part of this report with which your Lordship has not already been acquainted, and it is probable that M<sup>r</sup> Liston during his stay in the South may be able to throw some light upon the propositions which General Clarke pretends to have confidentially made to him through some British Agent.

I have the honour to be with the greatest respect

My Lord, Your Lordship's most obedient Humble Servant

EDW<sup>d</sup> THORNTON

<sup>1</sup> No. 57, Public Record Office, America 18.

<sup>2</sup> See *Annals of Fifth Congress*, II, 2404, 2413.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

*A History of Matrimonial Institutions, chiefly in England and the United States, with an Introductory Analysis of the Literature and the Theories of Primitive Marriage and the Family.* By GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD, Ph.D. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press; Callaghan and Company; London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1904. Three vols., pp. xv, 473; xv, 497; xv, 449.)

To students of sociology this work is one of importance. Unlike most which are published in three volumes, it could not well be reduced to two. It is divided into three parts. The first, which occupies half of the first volume, discusses primitive marriage and early rules of divorce. The second part, occupying the rest of volume I and part of volume II, takes up marriage and divorce in connection with the history of the Christian church, and with special reference to English laws and customs. The third and longest part, occupying most of the second and third volumes, explains the historical course of marriage and divorce in the United States, and is followed by a particularly full bibliographical index.

Part I gives a comprehensive and fair summary of the various theories of sociologists on the subject under consideration, accompanied by brief statements of the author's own conclusions. Like Westermarck and Hellwald, he does not shut his eyes to the fact that with other animals than man there is a sexual consort which may not unfairly be called marriage (I, 7); sometimes, as in the chelonia or tortoise group, monogamistic (I, 95), and, with birds, resulting in the establishment of a temporary family. Nor is he unwilling to apply the term marriage to the sexual relations which may have been maintained in common between the men and women of a particular tribe or horde. "Group marriages" between all or many of the members of the tribe may precede marriages between any particular pairs of them (I, 47, 53). He is not prepared to agree with Lubbock that monogamy is an invasion of what was a common right of all the members of the tribe (I, 120), and inclines to the position that in a loose form it is the earliest kind of sexual association. The probability of this he bases not on any moral or spiritual superiority in man, but on the fact that it seems to be required by the principles of organic evolution (I, 91). So far as morality is concerned, if a strict adherence to the marriage covenant for better or for worse be one of its consequences, the birds are more moral than men; for among them there is no divorce (I, 96). Monogamy, in the opinion of Dr. Howard, is not peculiarly a characteristic of advanced civilization. The institution of marriage develops in a circle,

(607)

and monogamy is found in its strictest form among the most backward races (I, 141, 150).

The author favors the view that not force but contract, and that a contract with the woman herself, is the foundation of primeval marriage (I, 178, 216). This would seem to be the case with the lower animals (I, 202, 222). Whether, however, the contract may not be at first with the father or head of the family, and later with the bride, must be regarded as yet in doubt. Among savages, still, a man frequently gains a wife by exchanging his sister or his daughter for her (I, 185). Post's suggestion is favored that consent marriages may be the normal type; then marriages by purchase or tribal consent follow; and then, with advancing civilization, the course be retraced to the starting-point, and the contract again made only or primarily with the bride (I, 202, 222).

In part II the course of the Christian church as to the celebration of marriage, culminating in the decree of the Council of Trent, is clearly traced, and the validity of the simply consensual marriage under the common law maintained (I, 316).

The chapter on the Protestant conception of marriage is a full and valuable one, and Luther's vacillating attitude is well described. The early troth-plights and child marriages of the Elizabethan age, as illustrated by the recent publications of the Early English Text Society, are explained (I, 399), and due place accorded to Cromwell's Civil Marriage Act in the succeeding century, with its provision for a public registry (I, 408, 418, 424). Following Stölzel, the author holds that the leaders in the Reformation held, as did Milton later, that such a breach of the marriage covenant as the Scriptures allowed to be a cause of divorce put an end to the marriage *ipso facto*, if the injured party so willed it (II, 69, 90).

The discussion of American matrimonial institutions covers familiar ground, but covers it well, and is founded on wide reading, including the consultation of many original documents, yet unprinted, in the offices of Massachusetts courts and the New York state archives (II, 121, 329). Due emphasis is laid on the regulation of marriage in New England by town orders (II, 143). Instances are given, from manuscript court files of two Massachusetts counties, of sentences of both adulteresses and adulterers to the brand of the scarlet letter (II, 175). The New England betrothal, with its similarity in form and consequences to the English *sponsalia*, is explained (II, 179, 185, 199), and the more or less tolerated bundling or proof-nights which sometimes preceded or followed it. A chapter on slave marriages in New England is especially interesting (II, 215-226). Two chapters are devoted to marriage in the southern and middle colonies. Colonial divorce requires less space. Where permitted, it was at first, as in England, a quasi-judicial proceeding. In Massachusetts and Connecticut the "assistants" or council granted them. From 1760 to 1786, ninety-six decrees were passed in the former government, a full docket of which

is published from court manuscripts, and may be useful to ancestor-hunters (II, 342, 344). South of Maryland no legislative divorces *a vinculo* were to be had (II, 367, III, 43). In New York and perhaps in New Jersey, the governor was the divorce court (II, 384).

The legislation of the states regarding marriage and divorce is laboriously detailed. Divorce *a vinculo* was a remedy to be had from the first in the courts of several; in others at the south it could come only from the legislature (III, 31). Often divorce has assumed the character of a log-rolling measure, and twenty or thirty couples have been released from the bond of marriage by a single bill (III, 42, 98). In South Carolina, except for a brief period during the days of Reconstruction, divorce has been impossible for any cause (III, 76). In some, by constitutional provisions, following the English usage, it must be initiated by a judicial and consummated by a legislative proceeding (III, 39, 43). In the territories the power to divorce was early assumed and continuously exercised by the legislative authorities, until they were deprived of such jurisdiction in 1886. The author has overlooked the full vindication of this practice in *Maynard vs. Hill*, 125 *United States Reports*, 191 (1888).

The closing chapter sums up the author's own opinions. He deplores the adherence of most of the states of the Union to the doctrine that a marriage may be illegal and yet valid, or, in other words, that statutes as to licenses, etc., are treated as merely directory (III, 170). He would place the celebration of marriage in the hands of local registrars (III, 193); introduce the divorce *nisi*, and in determining the sufficient causes let every particular political society admit such, and such only, as best promote its happiness (III, 220). For progress in such directions he finds the best hope in the conferences of state commissioners on uniform legislation, held in connection with the annual meetings of the American Bar Association (III, 223). But back of all legislation must come a closer family life, made all the closer because of the narrowing field within which state socialism is gradually contracting the father's powers (III, 226), and of the liberation of woman from every mark of inequality (III, 235). She must not be regarded as a child-bearing animal. Marriages and children may well be fewer, if they are better, and coeducation opens a door toward the formation of life-unions on lofty ideals (III, 242-256). In such unions "natural and sexual selection should play a smaller and artificial selection a larger rôle" (III, 258). In this chapter Dr. Howard is evidently holding himself in. He has more to say yet, and sociologists will be glad to hear from him further in the direction of the restraint of marriage in the interest of posterity.

SIMEON E. BALDWIN.

*The Historians' History of the World. A Comprehensive Narrative of the Rise and Development of Nations as Recorded by over two thousand of the Great Writers of all Ages.* Edited, with the assistance of a distinguished board of advisers and contributors, by HENRY SMITH WILLIAMS, LL.D. (New York: The Outlook Company; London: The History Association. 1904. Twenty-five volumes.)

THE general plan of *The Historians' History of the World* is undoubtedly familiar to all readers of the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW. It was certainly a novel idea to attempt to construct continuous narratives of the development of all the great historical nations by piecing together suitable extracts from contemporaneous and later writers with such editorial introductory and connecting paragraphs as were necessary, and so to produce not only a history of the world but, at the same time, an encyclopedia of historical literature of extraordinary range. The inherent difficulty in the scheme is that any extensive encyclopedia or anthology of historical writing must inevitably contain much that is antiquated as history proper, however interesting to the student of historical literature. In addition to this inherent necessity of incorporating a good deal of material that is not up to date, there is another factor which tends to increase the amount of antiquated material. In the field of English historical writing the copyright enjoyed by works abreast of present scholarship naturally compels a disproportionate selection from authors whose works are no longer copyright and so, from lapse of time, are out of date.

Against these inherent difficulties the editorial staff have contended with various degrees of success. I have examined with more or less care some twenty volumes of the *Historians' History*. In some cases I have been agreeably surprised by the degree to which these difficulties have been surmounted, and in others disappointed to find the difficulties apparently not realized. In the history of Greece (vols. III and IV), for example, one cannot but be favorably impressed by the extent to which the narrative has been derived from writers of the first rank, English or foreign. The matter on Greek colonization, for example, is derived almost entirely from Beloch's work not elsewhere accessible in English. Again, chapter 38, vol. VI, on the civilization of the first two centuries of the Roman empire, is made up of extracts from Renan's *Histoire des Origines du Christianisme*, Merivale's *Romans under the Empire*, Aulus Gellius's *Noctes Atticæ*, Boissier's *L'Opposition sous les Césars*, Marquardt's *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, and Bouché-Leclercq's *Manuel des Institutions Romaines*. The chapter on the Parthian empire (vol. VIII) is mainly derived from Gutschmid's *Geschichte Irans*, and the account of the Sassanids (*ibid.*) is almost wholly from Nöldeke's *Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte*. On the other hand, in the case of Spain and Portugal (vol. X) works antiquated in matter and never important for style like Busk and Dunham have been extensively drawn upon.

If one turns to the volumes on the United States (XXII-XXIII), one wonders what principle save that of least expense of time and thought suggested going to John Frost for the early life of Columbus or to S. G. Goodrich for his later days. On the other hand, it would be unfair not to point out that Irving's life is extensively used, that Columbus's Sanchez letter is quoted in full and that there are shorter citations from Las Casas and Peter Martyr, and that the editorial foot-notes evince familiarity with the critical literature. The editorial discussion of the Vespucci question, except the last paragraph and perhaps one or two minor statements, is as correct and lucid as it could be made in the space except by a past-master of condensation. The same may be said of the Smith-Pocahontas story.

The general narrative of the story of the English colonies relies largely upon Bancroft and Hildreth. For Massachusetts Barry is the chief modern authority, with several extensive passages from Bradford and the contemporary sources. Perhaps the most serious criticism to be passed upon the treatment of the United States is its gross disproportion. The period from 1814 to 1860 is covered in sixty-four pages, just the number allotted to the years 1770 to 1789, and only ten more than are accorded to the discoveries from 1492 until the death of Columbus. This part, consequently, is on the whole not so good as the average recent text-book and is in fact largely drawn from the old handbooks of Eliot and Lossing.

In general it seems to me that the series appears at its best in the volumes on the ancient orient, Greece, the Roman empire, and perhaps Russia. In these volumes the citations from the best works of modern scholarship in French and German are more numerous and the extracts from English writers of the second or third rank a half-century ago much fewer. The work of translation so far as I tested it in various passages from Kittel's *Geschichte der Hebräer* was well done. Most of the illustrations scattered through the volumes, except the portraits of historians, cannot for the most part but be disappointing to any but the crudest taste.

Two or three other features of the series should be noticed. The so-called bibliographies are extensive author check-lists, alphabetically arranged, of the historical literature relating to the different nations. Brief biographical sketches of the more important writers are interspersed. While the proof-reading of this section leaves much to be desired and while important omissions are not infrequent, the lists as a whole seem to me a very useful feature of the series.

More striking and of incontestable value are the forty-odd special essays contributed in the main by scholars of the first distinction in their respective fields. These men have generally taken these essays seriously, and there are few readers of whatever degree of general attainments who will not be impressed by such papers as Harnack's on "The Roman State and the Early Christian Church" (VI, 629-642), Wilamowitz-Möllendorff's on "The Development of the Hellenic Spirit"



(IV, 587-613), Wellhausen's on "Tribal Life of the Epic Period" in Arab history (VIII, 284-293), Goldziher's on "The Principles of Law in Islam" (*ibid.*, 294-304), or Nöldeke's on "The Scope and Influence of Arabic History" (*ibid.*, 1-24). In addition the history of each nation is summarized in a rather detailed chronological table, and each volume is equipped with one or more maps.

Taken all in all, the series has the unevenness of quality of every historical library, for, in fact, such it is. Reading its volumes will have a certain likeness to a kind of methodical browsing in the alcoves of a vast collection of historical writings with the help of a well-read and, on occasion, critically qualified mentor to guide one's course, supplemented with the additional opportunity of listening now and then to a lecture on the subject from a great modern master. The patron of the smaller public or circulating libraries, and such readers as have not access to large collections of historical works, will be able through the *Historians' History of the World* to sample the work of a wide range of ancient and modern writers. Such readers, too, as have access to large libraries and are fond of discursive historical reading, but yet are without expert guidance, will probably fare on the average quite as well by resorting to the *Historians' History* as they are likely to if they select books on their own initiative. Any one familiar with the relative circulation of various classes of historical works in the larger libraries and the narrow range of historical literature accessible in the smaller popular libraries would not hesitate, I think, after a careful examination of the *Historians' History*, to recognize it, in spite of the shortcomings from the scientific standpoint of much that it contains, as a notable and, in many ways, a very useful effort to extend and broaden popular knowledge of history and of historical literature.

EDWARD G. BOURNE.

*A History of the Ancient World for High Schools and Academies.*

By GEORGE STEPHEN GOODSPEED, Ph.D. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1904. Pp. xvi, 483.)

THIS history of the ancient world adds another to the already noteworthy list of text-books written in recent years by American historians. The proportions of the work, and therefore the relative importance which the author attaches to the main divisions of his subject, may be most effectively described by a simple statement of the number of pages which he assigns to each: oriental history receives sixty-nine, Greece one hundred and seventy, Rome and Europe to the time of Charlemagne two hundred and eight.

The history of the ancient orient, where centuries seem but years, presents a difficult problem for a writer whose narrative must conform in length to the few weeks which the high-school course can allow for its study. The author of the text under review has attacked this problem with unusual success. The essential features of the various

national civilizations, the influence of each on the other, and of all on the west are clearly set forth. The attention which is given to Syria and the people of Israel is very praiseworthy.

The Mycenæan period of Greek history is well handled. The author brings it down to about the year one thousand, and follows the generally accepted view in treating it as the "ancient" period of Greek history. The following three centuries are named the "middle age". It would be better to carry out the analogy to European history fully, and extend the middle age down to the Persian invasions, making it include the Homeric age, the period of colonization, the foundation of the city-state, and the beginnings of Greek civilization. The term "modern" would then be used for the centuries in which the fully-developed powers of Greek civilization express themselves in her history. The intricate detail of the history of the Hellenistic period is compressed into clearness; and the Greek side of Roman interference in the east is presented in a way which aids in understanding this phase of Roman history. As already implied, political history is everywhere kept within well-defined limits. Confused periods are treated briefly, and yet clearly and concretely.

In Roman history the proportions are in the measure of fifty-nine pages for the early history to the outbreak of the Punic wars, fifty-nine from thence to the death of Cæsar, fifty-four for the empire down to Diocletian, and thirty-one from the beginning of his reign to Charlemagne. Early Roman history is looked at from the agnostic standpoint of present-day scholarship; nevertheless the author's treatment is conservative and not radically destructive. Noticeable features of these pages are the emphasis which is laid on the strength and influence of the Etruscans, and on the participation of the Greeks in early Italian affairs. Without serious loss, somewhat less space could have been devoted to this period and used more effectively in other parts of Roman history. The progress of the Roman conquest of the west and east is systematically narrated, with all necessary reference to temporary circumstances and policy. The ill effects of the rapid acquisition of power and wealth attendant on this conquest are used to form an enlightening introduction to the story of the last century of the republic; but the treatment of that century is less satisfactory than the rest of the book. The author very properly avoids the over-amount of detail which often obscures the significance of this stormy time; but he does not bring out that significance with his usual force and clearness, except perhaps in the events in which Cæsar was concerned. The chapters on the empire are in many respects the most satisfactory in the whole book. The biographies of the emperors are reduced to a minimum; and more concern than usual is shown for the frontiers, the Germans, Christianity, and culture, and for changes in the constitution and in law. The closing pages contain an outline of early medieval history. The choice of points for emphasis is good; but they are so briefly handled that, at the most, they will be of value only as a guide for adapt-

ing longer accounts to the general scheme which has been followed in the earlier portions of the book.

The sum of the opinions on the several sections of this new textbook makes the judgment of it as a whole very favorable. It is abreast of the latest scholarship; its proportions—between the different nations, the periods in the history of each, and between political history and the history of civilization—are excellent. The material which is contained is but medium in amount, but the good proportions and the author's condensed and concrete style render it capable of effective expansion in the hands of an intelligent teacher. Sometimes, however, the style is condensed to the endangerment of clearness; and occasionally a word occurs which would send a high-school pupil to the dictionary; but such instances are the exception. Here and there come sentences which could be spared—none better than the one which states that "the west becomes the seat of the dynamo that supplies power to drive politics and civilization to higher achievements in a wider world" (p. 241).

For illustrations the publishers have inserted twenty-four finely executed plates, which are made more usable for teaching the history of art by the notes given in the second appendix. There are nineteen maps on full or double-page plates, and as many more in the text. These maps, with the exception of two or three of the smaller ones, are executed with clearness and emphasis. Questions for review, suggestive comparative studies, and topics follow each chapter or section. A number of chronological charts are given; they are carefully prepared, but are too complicated to be of much practical value either for study or for reference. The titles in the bibliographies are well selected, and the brief comments judicious; reference should be made, however, to a classical atlas which is already on the market, not merely to one which is announced.

ASA CURRIER TILTON.

*Prosopographia Attica*. Edidit JOHANNES KIRCHNER. (Berlin: Georg Reimer. 1901, 1902. Two vols., pp. viii, 603; vii, 660.)

THESE two volumes contain the names, and, where possible, the genealogies and noteworthy achievements of some 16,812 Athenian men, women, and children. They aim to furnish us with a complete register of the Athenians of the prechristian era who are mentioned in the ancient literatures and inscriptions.

No such register existed in 1884 at the time the work was undertaken. The third edition of W. Pape's *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* had just appeared, but the purpose of this dictionary was, of course, quite different from that which Dr. Kirchner planned. It was practically impossible for the student to segregate the names in it according to the countries from which their bearers came, and even if such an undertaking were feasible, it would have been unprofitable,

because the collection did not pretend to be complete. Ten years later (1894) the first volume of Wissowa's revision of Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie* was published. This work, as is well known, was begun on so comprehensive a plan that few men in the least degree eminent could escape attention. But in a statistical survey, such as Dr. Kirchner had in mind, hosts of obscure persons from every walk of life, who were omitted in both of these forerunners, must be ferreted out to take their place beside those who had won distinction in history—in a word, completeness must be the object and justification of the undertaking.

In this, the author, so far as we can judge from a few searching tests, has succeeded. The reviewer has consulted the *Prosopographia Attica* for the family affiliations of the Athenians who figure in the public documents between 307 and 262 B. C., and between 103 and 88 B. C., and has found, from a name which is here and there missing, the clearest proof of Dr. Kirchner's thoroughness. In *Inscriptiones Græcæ*, II, 611, for example, the motion was made by Kleon, son of Leokrates, of Salamis. No such name appears in our register. A careless workman would probably have inserted it. But from the content and character of the decree it is clear, on closer examination, that Kleon belonged, not to the Attic Salamis, but to Salamis in Cyprus. The *Prosopographia* contains no foreigners.

Perhaps Dr. Kirchner has erred in drawing the line between citizens and non-citizens too closely. Dr. Alfred Körte (*Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1903, 837 ff.) has supplemented the register by a long list of names of sculptors, potters, vase-painters, and others whom he affirms to have been Athenians. It may be that the author has not proceeded consistently in admitting or rejecting those upon whom the citizenship was conferred by special vote. And other minor defects may be pointed out. Thus, Neaichmos in *Inscriptiones Græcæ*, II, 581, is correctly listed as *demarch*, and yet the inscription is dated in 320–319, just as if he had been the *archon eponymus* for the year. Such mistakes are bound to occur. Here, like misprints, they are remarkably few.

Dr. Kirchner's work has not been a slavish sorting of cards. There is hardly a name in the register which does not show that his mind has been constantly alert for new combinations of individuals into families, for new identifications of otherwise isolated persons, and for new assignments of decrees and catalogues to their proper place in time. The work represents a very considerable addition to our knowledge. Indeed, we may venture to surmise that it was the uninterrupted series of discoveries which he made that stimulated the author to spend the best nineteen years of his life on the compilation of a dictionary of names. The task in itself, however, was well worth the effort. Dr. Kirchner has prepared an indispensable aid to every one who concerns himself closely with Athenian life. It is now possible, as never before, to write the history of Athenian politics. The party in power during obscure periods can often be determined from the known opinions of

the families represented during those periods in public life. We can now proceed to write the local history of Attica, since the men prominent in each deme are now readily determinable. The occupations pre-vaillingly practised in the various districts may be ascertained. Already we have learned something as to the social standing of different religious and other organizations. The distribution of the population over Attica and in the demes and tribes may be observed from the *Conspectus Demotarum* (II, 493 ff.), but here an uncertain quality exists, in that registration does not imply residence. Of course, the names listed under each deme are gathered from documents preserved by chance and scattered over a period of about seven centuries. Accordingly, we get from them only proportional, not absolute numbers. Similar ratios are established in the fourth century B. C. by the fact that the representation of the demes in each of the ten prytanies of the senate was determined by population.

The work is not final. While it was being printed, as many as 1,224 additions had to be made. Since its appearance, moreover, several new Attic inscriptions have been published, and every day, we hope, others will be found. But no one can deny that the great mass of the Athenian names is now before us in these volumes by Dr. Kirchner, and students of Greek history are under heavy obligations to him for the long years of patient effort devoted to their collection, arrangement, and publication.

W. S. FERGUSON.

*The Campaign of Plataea, September, 479 B. C.* By HENRY BURT WRIGHT, Ph.D. (New Haven: The Tuttle, Morehouse, and Taylor Company. 1904. Pp. 148.)

To the general subject discussed in this thesis Dr. Wright has made one contribution. He concludes that Pausanias had formed the plan of drawing Mardonius into a locality unsuited for cavalry, and that with this in view he exposed his army to attack, first in entering the depression, in which the battle of Plataea was actually fought, before mounting the Asopus Ridge, and secondly in abandoning this strong position and in retreating, apparently in confusion, across the narrow valley with the "Island" to the south as his presumed objective. Thereby the generalship of Pausanias is vindicated, and the reason becomes clear for the great reputation he enjoyed in popular estimation before the Byzantium fiasco, and subsequently in the judgment of military experts like Thucydides. Herodotus indicates the movements correctly, but goes astray in interpreting them. What he gives is not even the private soldier's account of manœuvres which he did not comprehend. It is that account, perverted by the Athenian prejudice against Sparta during the early years of the Peloponnesian War. This, of course, has been already demonstrated by Eduard Meyer. Dr. Wright goes further, however, and in making his second main point contends that the contempt of Herodotus for Spartan courage is explicable only

on the theory that he was writing after the surrender at Sphacteria in 425 B. C. Others have concluded that nothing in the work of Herodotus shows knowledge of occurrences later than 428 B. C.

The reviewer must confess that he has not been convinced by Dr. Wright's argumentation in either instance. He can simply remark that it is a doubtful rehabilitation of Pausanias which makes him undertake so perilous a movement as the retreat by night from an impregnable position (p. 65) across a depression so gentle as to tempt the foe to use his cavalry—especially in view of the heterogeneity of the Greek army. Nothing short of decisive tactical superiority could justify such a risk, and if this was known to rest with the Greeks, the earlier hesitancy of the Spartan military authorities remains unexplained. Besides, it seems to result from Grundy's description (*The Great Persian War*, 499 ff.) that the depression was really suited for cavalry action.

The thesis, however, is not exhausted when these two conclusions are rejected. As a whole, it reveals sound judgment and careful work. At times, perhaps, the author does violence to historic facts in preparing the way for his theory, for example in his general characterization of the period from 479 to 449 B. C. (p. 38). Misprints, such as "golden statute of him at Delphi" (p. 84), are fortunately rare.

W. S. FERGUSON.

*The Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome.* By SAMUEL BALL PLATNER. [College Latin Series.] (Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 1904. Pp. xiv, 514.)

IN the preface to this work the author states the purpose of the book "to serve as an introduction to the study of the topography of ancient Rome for students of Roman antiquities and history, and incidentally as a book of reference for those who have any special interest in the monuments which still remain". He adds a modest statement that the book "makes no claim to exhaustiveness or originality; it is only a compilation", drawn largely from Richter, "*whose Topographie der Stadt Rom* has been practically the basis of the present work". The writing of an introduction is always an ungrateful task; your prospective audience is composed of individuals whose mental status is largely a matter of theory, and it is easy for a critic to complain that the author has presupposed too little or too much knowledge on the part of his readers. Scarcely any two men would set the tone at the same place in the intellectual scale. Possibly very humble beginners may crave an additional amount of elementary explanation, but in compensation the more advanced student will find certain matters more conveniently presented than in Richter, notably in regard to bridges, aqueducts, walls, and gates. The chapter on "Building Materials and Methods" is also an improvement on Richter, but here the student will still have to go to the incomparable Middleton. It seems very unfor-

fortunate that the chapter on the "Development of the City" has no companion piece in the "Destruction of the City", a subject quite as important and equally fascinating; and one is tempted into wondering whether the book would not have been more readable had foot-notes been used more fully to contain the numerous centimeter measurements and the contradictory theories which merely interrupt the narrative when inserted directly in the text. But possibly foot-notes were avoided out of respect for the apparent prejudice which the majority of American writers have against such foot-notes as tending to make a book ponderous. As a matter of fact, however, foot-notes, if properly used, tend to lighten the narrative without sacrificing accuracy and to provide a special training-table for the more voracious of one's readers.

Roman topography is moving very rapidly these days, and it is not to be expected that any book on the subject will last long without being out of date; it is, however, all the more necessary that a book should be thoroughly up to its date of publication. In this respect Professor Platner is to be distinctly congratulated, for although our knowledge of topography is beginning to get ahead of the book (*e. g.*, p. 256, as the *lacus Curtius* has since been discovered), the author is thoroughly conversant with what had been done up to the time of writing. News of the excavation of the *ara Pacis* evidently reached America too late to be of use (p. 341). The illustrations are apt to be the worst part of a book written by a scholarly man. The publishers and the general reader are more interested in the illustrations than the author is, but in the present case the care which has evidently been given to the choice of the illustrations (*vide* the list of sources) has been rewarded, and there is much to praise. The picture of the northwest corner of the Palatine (p. 158) is out of date and had much better have been omitted. The detailed plan of the Hippodrome (p. 153) does not agree with the general plan (fig. 16, p. 128); and the plan of the Temple of Venus and Roma (p. 298) is not entirely in accord with the description on page 299.

Judged as an "introduction", the book seems open to some slight criticism. It is questionable whether the habit of giving the exact measurements (especially in the metric system) of so many things is going to be of much help to the beginner; it might serve rather as a discouragement, and certainly it is of no value to the general reader. Then too the paucity of references among the sources to the sketches of the Renaissance architects keeps the beginner in ignorance of this source, which is of constantly increasing value since Middleton's book. Then too (p. 6) a caution ought to be inserted regarding the use of coins as topographical evidence. The book is remarkably free from misprints, unless the mistakes in the points of the compass (*e. g.*, pp. 37, 127, 149, 152) are to be included under this head.

In a book which contains so many facts and theories it is an easy matter to pick out points where a difference of opinion is permissible. I mention a few such points: the statement that the "present topog-



raphy of the city is in its main features precisely the same as when the first settlements were made" (p. 15) seems rather exaggerated when one remembers the cutting down of hill spurs, the rise of artificial mounds, and the general change of level. The absence of metal in the *pons Sublicius* is not in itself a sufficient ground for dating it before the knowledge of metal (p. 79). No metal was used so that the bridge could be easily destroyed. The *atrium Vestæ* is said to have had "two and perhaps three stories" (p. 201). There were certainly three and at the south side probably five. The reference to the Anglo-Saxon coins (p. 203) were better altogether omitted unless space can be spared for some further explanation. The Ionic column of the *ædicula Vestæ*, referred to as *in situ* (p. 204), is a restoration. It is by no means certain that the balustrades now standing on the pavement of the forum belonged to the rostra (p. 216); it has been repeatedly asserted but never proved, and the measurements do not seem to agree. The black marble pavement was reset by Maxentius but not originally built by him (p. 239). People did not use thick slabs of marble in the time of Maxentius. The *scalæ Gemoniæ* did not branch off from the *gradus Monetæ* (p. 278), but were merely another name for that part of the *gradus Monetæ* which was near the *Carcer*. The first triumphal arch in Rome (p. 300) was not that of Q. Fabius Allobrogicus (B. C. 121) but that of Stertinius (B. C. 196, cf. Livy, XXXIII, 27). The theory of the velaria for the Colosseum is given as a fact (p. 312), whereas it is supported on very weak evidence and has grave technical difficulties.

But these suggestions, many of which are open to discussion, touch on relatively few points, considering the large number of disputed matters with which the book has to deal. Possibly they may be of use in a subsequent edition, which will undoubtedly be demanded; at any rate they are merely the exceptions which prove the generally judicious character of the statements made.

JESSE BENEDICT CARTER.

*The Private Life of the Romans.* By HAROLD WHETSTONE JOHNSTON. [Lake Classical Series.] (Chicago: Scott, Foresman, and Company. 1903. Pp. 344.)

TWENTY years ago the undergraduate classical courses in our American colleges and universities were limited somewhat strictly to the interpretation of a few select masterpieces of ancient literature. Barring an occasional lecture, no attempt was made to give formal instruction in the history of classical literature, institutions, archæology, or private life. Hence classical studies frequently used to be reproached with being narrowly grammatical and linguistic. As one father wittily said: "Homer may be the prince of poets and Demosthenes the prince of orators. But what of it, if after a dozen years' study of Greek my son hasn't a spark of enthusiasm for either?" This, of course, was

putting the case rather strongly, but there is no doubt that there was much justice in the protests raised against the classics as formerly pursued. Classical study did, beyond question, long shut itself up too exclusively to a study of words and sentences. In recent years, it is pleasant to note, all this has radically changed, and to-day in most institutions of consequence formal synthetic courses in the literature and institutions of the classical peoples are prominent features of the college curriculum.

The book before us is an outcome, as it is also an index, of the changed conception of classical teaching just mentioned. In fairly compact compass it treats in successive chapters of the family, the Roman name, marriage and the position of women, children and education, dependents, slaves, clients, *hospites*, the house and its furniture, dress and personal adornment, food and meals, games, the circus, gladiators, baths, travel, correspondence, books, sources of income and means of living, death and burial ceremonies.

The task which the author has set himself is no light one, for our information on many, perhaps most, of the topics here embraced is often provokingly scanty and not infrequently conflicting. Moreover no book of similar scope exists which can be regarded as at all satisfactory for the purposes of collegiate instruction. Wilkins's manual is but a primer; the work of the Misses Preston and Dodge is not merely meager in extent but rests upon no independent study; while Ramsay's work has long been hopelessly antiquated. Under these circumstances the opportunity existed to produce a work which should be a credit to its author and render a signal service to the cause of classical education. It is a pleasure to recognize that Professor Johnston has availed himself of this opportunity with eminent success. His book not merely gives ample testimony to thorough scholarship and conscientious attention to minute details, but also reveals a ripe teacher, full of pedagogical resource. Witness, for example, the diagrams prepared to illustrate *patria potestas*, *agnati*, and family relationships. A broad view characterizes the book throughout. To Professor Johnston, classical philology is evidently no mere dogma, but a living reality; and one of the most valuable features of his volume is the frequency of his observations on the relation and contrast of ancient and modern ideas and institutions.

The book is well supplied with illustrations, most of which are excellently chosen, though the purpose in including portraits of Brutus, Scipio, and Sulla in the chapter on the family, and those of sundry Roman emperors in the account of the Roman name is not obvious. Almost nothing has been omitted that could fairly be expected to find a place in a work of this character. Perhaps a somewhat fuller treatment of arts and industries might wisely be included in a subsequent edition. Apparently no mention is made of the aqueduct system, or of the *acta diurna*, the Romans' nearest approach to a newspaper. But these topics are no doubt intentionally omitted as belonging strictly within the limits of public, rather than of private, antiquities. Though

prepared primarily for professed students of the classics, Professor Johnston's volume ought to appeal to a much wider circle. It is a book which every cultivated person may read with interest and profit.

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

*Roman Historical Sources and Institutions.* Edited by HENRY A. SANDERS. [University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Volume I.] (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1904. Pp. iv, 402.)

THE University of Michigan devotes the initial volume of her *Studies* (Humanistic Series) to a collection of essays dealing with Roman historical sources and institutions, under the editorship of Professor Henry A. Sanders. It is gratifying to receive this witness to the vitality at Michigan of a branch of investigation so undeservedly neglected in this country; and we note with satisfaction the announcement that a half-dozen volumes continuing the series are already in preparation. Apart from Professor Dennison's discussion of the singing of the "Sæcular" Hymn, all the papers are historical in theme. They display diligence and zeal; in view of our American failure to insist upon drill in clear and easy English composition as a preliminary to historical writing, it is perhaps ungracious to object to their literary baldness and disjointedness; but none of the essays shows a facile pen.

Miss Mary G. Williams of Mt. Holyoke follows up her *Julia Domna* (*American Journal of Archaeology*, 2d series, VI, 259-305) of 1902 with a similar study of *Julia Mamæa*. This is accurate and exhaustive. Dr. Duane R. Stuart investigates Dio Cassius's use of epigraphic material, and reaffirms the earlier verdict of negligence. Professor Drake takes Cauer's tabulation (now over twenty years old!) of inscriptions relating to officers below the centurion's rank, and traces the rise and decline of the *principalitas* in the pre-Diocletian army. Dr. G. H. Allen of Cincinnati presents a valuable study of centurions as substitute commanders, based on the inscriptions.

Professor Sanders's two disquisitions occupy well toward one-half the volume. In the first, he collects all versions of the Tarpeia myth, following Krahner, and adds some allied stories. Two of these, Persian myths whose irrelevancy he admits, are quoted in French and German versions long since superseded; another, a Charlemagne story found in the *Chronicon Novaliciense* (3, 14), is taken, without indication of ultimate origin, from Grimm's *Deutsche Sagen*! The whole study would have gained greatly by compression and elimination; it is hard to winnow out the wheat, and even the sensible discussion of the origin of the myth lacks clearness. Misprints (especially in the Greek quotations) and inconcininities are too frequent. Nonius and Gellius are cited from old texts with readings now abandoned. After the Nissen-Haupt controversy and Döhner's excellent dissertation, it is strange to be referred back to Schmidt on Zonaras's use of Plutarch.

In his discussion of the lost Epitome of Livy, Professor Sanders does himself greater justice. He criticizes Reinhold's and Drescher's recent dissertations and continues and defends his thesis of 1897, in which he showed that this abridgment was composed as early as Tiberius's reign. The correct attribution of later statements to this vanished condensation of Livy is a peculiarly delicate task, as has been well pointed out by Schwartz apropos of Dio Cassius. Professor Sanders has collected numerous resemblances of statement in late historians, and his general conclusions agree with those of earlier investigators and are certainly sound; but the aptness of several of his parallelisms must remain a matter of opinion. The collection has however a permanent value for all students of Roman historical tradition. From Pliny's citation of *Livius filius* as a source for a portion of book 5, in which we do find a fragment of the Epitome, and from one or two other indications, Professor Sanders ventures to guess that the historian's son was his abridger. What a pity, since this study was not already published when the discovery of the Oxyrhynchus fragment was heralded, that the volume was not held and the essay worked over in the light which the new abstract throws upon the whole subject, as just pointed out by Professors Moore of Harvard and Kornemann of Tübingen!

CHARLES UPSON CLARK.

*Seven Roman Statesmen of the Later Republic.* By CHARLES W.

C. OMAN, M.A. (London: Edward Arnold; New York: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1902. Pp. viii, 348.)

THE seven statesmen are the two Gracchi, Sulla, Crassus, the younger Cato, Pompey, and Cæsar. Their lives, as Mr. Oman points out (p. 11), "completely cover the last century of Rome's *ancien régime*"; or, more precisely, they cover the course of the Roman revolution. The *ancien régime* received a fatal shock when Tiberius Gracchus appealed to the direct expression of the popular will without regard to the checks and balances of the constitution. In reality he thus forced the issue of personal versus constitutional government; and this was not finally settled until Augustus found a *modus vivendi* for both, that the lion and the lamb might lie down together, with the lamb, as it proved, ultimately inside. In the nature of the issue we have one reason why the story of the hundred years required for its settlement may well be told in a series of biographical studies. Each of Mr. Oman's seven statesmen, with the exception of Cato, whose career after all might have been quite as well left to incidental treatment as that of Marius or of Cicero, represented the monarchical principle, each more distinctly than his predecessor. Thus the true meaning of the whole process, as Mr. Oman indicates in his preface, may be brought out by concentrating attention upon the personal element.

Although the cardinal facts of the story are common property and allow of no radically new explanation, yet they are invested with new

interest by Mr. Oman's literary skill, his graphic and often colloquial style, his genial and pungent wit—as of the Oxford common-room, his thoroughly individual appreciation of each of the leading figures, and his presentation of the whole movement in modern and realistic terms. The seven are for him, as for Mommsen, not “Plutarch's men”, but actual politicians, which they become when studied by one who knows more about history and politics than Plutarch did. M. Livius Drusus was a Tory-Democrat (p. 104). Crassus reminds him of “that wonderful old Whig, the Duke of Newcastle” (p. 191). He clinches the proof that it was not protracted warfare but foreign competition that ruined Italian agriculture by observing that “otherwise the Roman farmer, like the British farmer in the golden days of the struggle with Napoleon, might have prayed for ‘a bloody war and a wet harvest,’ as the things most likely to send up wheat to 120 s. the quarter” (p. 17). The gratitude of the proletariat, when Caius Gracchus put through his bill for the sale of the tithe-corn at half the market-price, reminds him “of the Portuguese army when it saluted its commander with the shout, ‘Long live Marshal Beresford, who takes care of our bellies’” (p. 59). “The Aedui and the Remi”, he observes, “stood to Cæsar in Gaul much as the Nawabs of Oude and the Carnatic stood to the British in India” (p. 316), while the spade-work of Cæsar's and Pompey's soldiers in front of Dyrrhachium finds its like nowhere except in the “interminable entrenchments around Richmond and Petersburg” in 1864–1865 (p. 329).

There are three possible verdicts, each of which found expression in antiquity, in the case of the Government *vs.* Tiberius Gracchus. Either his programme and his methods were equally justifiable, or his aims were right but his means wrong, or both aims and means alike are to be condemned. Mr. Oman finds against him on both counts and for convincing reasons. The agrarian law, for the sake of which he had no “right to pull down the constitution about the ears of the people” (p. 49), was a perfectly futile attempt to suspend—on what we should call populist principles—the operation of economic causes. Not the greed of the rich, but cheap grain from abroad, was ruining the small farmer. The only remedy, says Mr. Oman, was protection, and this could not be had because “the city mob would never vote for the dear loaf” (p. 24).

In reviewing the ten years that passed between the death of Tiberius and the tribunate of Caius Gracchus, Mr. Oman neglects to explain how it happened that the agrarian law was allowed to stand and why its execution was subsequently checked. In other words, he ignores the intervention of the group of moderates headed by Scipio Æmilianus, whose attitude toward the question of reform is most instructive and, in a very true sense, prophetic. Scipio saw clearly the rocks upon which the good ship Constitution was drifting, but believed that it was impossible to escape them. “Either we are lost”, he said, “or we are lost.” This is the only instance in which Mr. Oman has allowed him-

self to ignore a significant and impressive personality, without which the story of the revolution is incomplete.

It is at least open to question whether Mr. Oman is correct in the assumption that Caius Gracchus reenacted his brother's agrarian law only because it looked well in the democratic programme. It looks more like the chief end of his legislation, the goal to be gained at the price of the corn dole for the proletariat, the courts and the taxes of Asia for the capitalists, and monarchical power for the reigning demagogue. In the permanent influence of the equestrian order, as constituted by Caius and controlled by a syndicate of big capitalists—what Mr. Lawson would call a "System", Mr. Oman recognizes a conspicuous instance of the evil that men do living after them; but he fails to note that it was these capitalists who compelled the declaration of war against Jugurtha and steadily backed Marius, one of their own class, until his democratic ally Saturninus began to attack vested interests. Then they compelled Marius to abandon Saturninus to their vengeance. It was the young and active members of the equestrian order—and not, strictly speaking, an "Optimate mob" (p. 103)—who put Saturninus to death. Capital had dropped the democrats when they became anarchists, just as it recoiled in horror when Crassus and Cæsar put up Catiline to attack society that they might be its saviors. When Mr. Oman mentions the young equites who on December 5, 63 B. C., waited for Cæsar sword in hand (p. 183), he might have reminded us that they were minded to do to Cæsar as their grandsires had done to Saturninus.

Another crisis that remains more or less of a riddle in Mr. Oman's book is the one that began in the year 88 B. C. In agreement with Mommsen he represents the Sulpician revolution and the civil war between Marius and Sulla as hinging solely on "mere personal rivalry for a military command" (p. 113). It has, however, been conclusively shown by Nitzsch that it was again the capitalists—well-nigh ruined in the financial panic due to the Social War, the successes of Mithridates, and the massacre of their agents in Asia Minor, exasperated by the revival of the old law against interest, and resolved not to allow the Senate to get possession of the fat province of Asia—who forced through the Sulpician laws and secured the appointment of Marius to the command of the army of the east, with which the Senate had legally vested Sulla. The war between Sulla and the Marians was a war between the Senate and the "System". When Sulla finally became master and monarch of Rome, sixteen hundred financiers were sent to join a thousand of their confrères who had fallen in the course of the war, and their property was confiscated. That was the end of the "System" as a political factor of dangerous magnitude.

Mr. Oman's admirable portraits of Sulla and Crassus do not vary from the prevailing conceptions of these men sufficiently to arouse dissent; but it is otherwise with his treatment of Cato, Pompey, and Cæsar. Of them he writes (p. 236): "It is hardly necessary to say



that Mommsen's estimate of Pompey is no more to be taken seriously than his estimates of Cicero, or Cato, or Cæsar. It is as misleading to treat him as a mere drill-sergeant, as to call Cicero a 'fluent Consular', or Cato a 'mere Don Quixote,' or Cæsar a beneficent and unselfish saviour of society." Apart from the question whether any judgment of the "master of those who know" Roman history is not to be taken seriously even when it must be reversed on appeal, it hardly seems to the present writer that Mr. Oman has succeeded in rehabilitating Cato's reputation for normal common-sense or that he has devoted sufficient attention to Cicero to make clear the issue between himself and the great scholar from whom he has learned so much. For him, too, Cicero is "the unfortunate orator" (p. 228), led astray at a critical moment by his "idiotic vanity" (p. 189). As for Pompey, Mommsen undoubtedly misunderstood him, but it is a question whether Mr. Oman, in his reaction from Mommsen's view, has not assumed an attitude so erect as to have endangered his own equilibrium. We may admit that Pompey did not ineffectually seek the crown, without having to regard him as thoroughly loyal to the republican constitution. One would never get the impression from Mr. Oman's book that it was he, more than any other man, who threw the republican machine out of gear. He was not content with the honor of being the "first citizen in the Republic" (p. 288); he wanted chief power as well, but was unwilling to say so. It must come to him, Pompeius Magnus, as a tribute to his greatness. For this reason he affected indifference to the Gabinian law, not because (p. 250) he "doubted his own capacity" to clear the sea of pirates. For this reason he disbanded his army on his return from the east, not because (p. 261) he was a model of "civic virtue". For this reason he looked on at the anarchy of 54-53 B. C.—which Mr. Oman regards as very "curious" (p. 276)—not because he did not know what ought to be done, but because he meant to compel the government to throw itself into his arms, as it finally had to do. He accordingly did choose to play the rôle of savior of society, for which Mr. Oman thinks he had no inclination (p. 288). There is damaging evidence against the purity of Pompey's intentions in the confidential correspondence of Cicero, and, although the *Bellum Civile* was a campaign document, there is no good reason to doubt Cæsar's statement that on January 1, 49 B. C., when his own march on Rome was imminent, the Pompeians threatened to join hands with him and wreak united vengeance on the recalcitrant Senate. The Senate realized fully that it had only the choice of masters. Pompey, we repeat, did not wish to be king; but he conceived of himself as entitled to be the successor of Sulla as an extra-constitutional executive, the guardian of the empire and its earthly providence. Thus Pompey and not Cæsar was the true forerunner of Augustus.

Mr. Oman's portrait of the great Julius is more convincing. He does not blink the seamy side of Cæsar's career. The aristocratic young demagogue, with his extraordinary capacity for self-advertisement and



for "getting through money—especially other people's money" (p. 302), who led gangs of thugs to the polls and was at the same time "the inevitable co-respondent in every fashionable divorce" (p. 301), gets his due on all these counts; nor is it admitted that he can be truthfully represented even in his later years "as a staid and divine figure replete with schemes for the benefit of humanity" (p. 292). He remains "the great adventurer" (p. 284). "The monarch of the world was at bottom the same man as the clever young scamp whose epigrams and adulteries had scandalised Rome thirty years back" (p. 292). Yet nowhere has his consummate mastery of military, as of political, strategy and tactics been more effectively presented and analyzed than by the accomplished historian of the art of war in this the most interesting chapter of his excursion into Roman history. Nothing could be better than his explanation of the unparalleled variety of Cæsar's campaigns by the fact that the conqueror of Gaul "was essentially an amateur of genius, who had taken to war late in life, and not a soldier steeped from his youth upwards in the study of the drill-book and the manœuvres of the barrack yard" (p. 322); and with this may be coupled the reminder that "his final object was not so much the conquest of Gaul, as the building up for himself of an unrivalled military reputation and a devoted army" (p. 321). In short, the explanation of his whole career is to be found in "enlightened ambition and the love of doing work well, if it has to be done at all" (p. 291). Mr. Oman gives us this very realistic Cæsar in express antithesis throughout to the ideal Cæsar constructed by Mommsen, whose *Römische Geschichte* was an apotheosis of the great revolutionist, conceived in the heyday of youth by a son of the German revolutionary movement, but largely rejected by the sober second thoughts of a less turbulent age. It would have been only fair to state that, in declining to write his fourth volume, Mommsen tacitly admitted his youthful error; and if Mr. Oman had bethought himself of Mommsen's own reconstruction of the Augustan Principate, as based on the "dyarchy" of Senate and Princeps, he would hardly have left us with the conclusion that Cæsar had solved the problem of sovereignty by establishing an autocracy (p. 339). Cæsar's solution was, as he says, logical, but it was certainly not practical nor definitive.

On page 189 the note should refer to the fourteenth and not the thirteenth letter in the first book of Cicero's correspondence with Atticus, and on page 215 the reference is to the eighth and not the third paragraph of the letter there cited. On pages 258 and 273 we have "negligible", on page 218 "negligeable". The illustrations reproduce the Naples bust of Cæsar, the so-called Pompey, also in Naples, and three sets of historically significant coins. Since 1886, when Helbig published the authentic and very characteristic head of Pompey, now in Copenhagen, there has been really no excuse for continuing to serve up the Naples bust, which had previously been discredited by Bernoulli.

HENRY A. SILL.

*La Plus Ancienne Décretale.* Thèse présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Paris. Par E. CH. BABUT. (Paris: Société Nouvelle de Librairie et d'Édition. 1904. Pp. 87.)

*Le Concile de Turin.* Essai sur l'Histoire des Églises provençales au V<sup>e</sup> Siècle et sur les Origines de la Monarchie romaine. Par E. CH. BABUT. [Bibliothèque de la Fondation Thiers, Fascicule VI.] (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1904. Pp. xi, 313.)

THESE two theses presented to the University of Paris invest the study of the chronological problems of obscure documents with charm of style and a wealth of scholarship. With the ease of full knowledge and accurate penetration, M. Babut interprets these minor data in the framework of an interesting historic process. In the first thesis he persuasively argues his discovery of the earliest extant decretal from a Roman bishop. Among the canons of councils in the manuscript of Angoulême (sixth century) is a document entitled *Canones Romanorum*, which editors have assumed to be the canons of a Roman synod under Siricius (384-399) or Innocent I (401-417). M. Babut argues that we have not a synodal epistle but a decretal from Damasus the predecessor of Siricius. It is shown conclusively that Siricius mentions the document in a letter and that Siricius and Innocent gave more rigorous rules for the cases with which the document deals. The most important case is the question of admitting to the clergy men who had been married after baptism for the second time. The milder position taken by the document is in harmony with Jerome (Ep. LXIX) and is to be assigned to Jerome's protector Damasus rather than to the more rigorous successors. We find, moreover, a less advanced stage of decretal authority. The document argues, while Siricius is known to have commanded the provincial churches. The fact that the author of the canons does not impose law but instructs as to Roman usage is used by M. Babut to explain the later erroneous entry of the document among the acts of councils. The bishops of Gaul who received the instruction did not regard the Roman bishop as their canonical ruler. The pope's name did not matter and was not transcribed in the early copies.

The second thesis illustrates more amply the relation of Gallic churches to the Roman see. Leo I, finding the Gallic bishops indisposed to yield to his decisions, obtained from Valentinian III the famous decree which made the papal commands obligatory as law for the bishops of Gaul. This measure was necessitated by an earlier crisis. M. Babut aims to fix the date and meaning of the synodal letter of Turin in connection with this earlier effort to extend the ecclesiastical monarchy of Rome over the Provençal bishops. Most authors have conjectured for the lost date of the synodal letter the year 401. Babut holds that the synod's action was intended to invalidate the decretal of Zosimus in March, 417, which ordered Patroclus, bishop of Arles, to assume metropolitan rights in the three provinces of Vienne and Narbonne I and II. The argument turns upon the effort to provide a setting for the acts

of the synod between two letters of Zosimus dated September 22 and September 29. The second of these letters must be provoked by the mere tidings that the synod has opened discussion of the decretal of March. To escape a difficulty it has to be conjectured that another papal letter (*Quod de Proculi*, September 26) has erroneously received the date of the document enrolled just before it in the records of Arles.

To substantiate this construction, which seems to merit assent, Babut gives a very interesting and detailed account of the ecclesiastical conditions of Gaul in the fifth century, and promises a further work on Saint Martin of Tours. He will show that Martin narrowly escaped condemnation for Priscillian views and that Priscillian was only an ascetic pietist, the dogmatic heresies charged upon him being a false misrepresentation.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

*The Dark Ages.* By W. P. KER. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1904. Pp. x, 361.)

PROFESSOR KER, of University College, London, presents, under the special title of *The Dark Ages*, the first volume of a series of Periods of European Literature to be edited by Professor Saintsbury. As in duty bound, he begins with an attempt to define this much-abused term. He devotes to this his first two chapters, nearly a quarter of the whole little volume. Chronologically he limits his period by the decline of Roman culture on the one hand and the year 1100 on the other. These limits include, so we are told, the migration of the Teutonic peoples, of which Mr. Ker regards the Norman conquest of England as the last wave. He does not mention the Norman occupation of southern Italy, and why the Norman conquest of England is any more a piece of the Teutonic migration than the later and vaster expansion of Teutonic life in the lands eastward from the Elbe is not clear. However, periods must end somewhere, if only for the convenience of the literary historian, and if we must have a "dark" time, we are not disposed to quarrel with Mr. Ker's thesis that with the beginning of the twelfth century a new light is visible both in the subjects and the methods of literary treatment. In the second chapter, "The Elements", we are given a general survey of the whole period with reference specially to the material utilized in literature. The main body of the volume is then divided into two parts, treating respectively the "Latin Authors" and "The Teutonic Languages"; and a short final chapter on the literature of Ireland and Wales completes what is at best but a hasty survey of a vast field.

Of Mr. Ker's scholarly equipment for his task there can be no doubt. The whole volume bristles with "reading". There are enough learned references here to challenge the literary expert at every turn. Indeed, we can hardly see how any one can understand this book to whom the things it deals with are not already perfectly familiar. To such a one it offers a somewhat confused résumé of matters he should know

already. For the young student it is far too abstruse, and for the general reader it lacks the unity and concentration which alone can command his attention. This failure to appeal to a definable audience is the more to be regretted because Mr. Ker shows us at times that he is capable of straightforward and vivid characterization. For example his treatment of the Monk of St. Gall and the nun Hrotsuit gives us really valuable little sketches of important works. The same might have been said of his sketch of Liutprand of Cremona were it not that in the five pages (180-185) devoted to this author we have no less than sixteen literary allusions, every one of which would tax the learning of an adept in comparative literature. Mr. Ker's bane is fine writing; he has a certain sense of humor that now and then is useful, but it leads him into long ways around where directness and compactness are prime necessities. He is not willing merely to tell us about literature; he must still be making literature himself. It is true that reading about literature is generally dreary work enough, but this is all the more reason why the literary historian should suppress himself to the last degree and furnish us mainly with illustrations from his authors of the ideas he is seeking to make clear.

E. E.

*A History of Mediæval Political Theory in the West.* By R. W. CARLYLE and A. J. CARLYLE. Volume I. *The Second Century to the Ninth.* By A. J. CARLYLE, M.A. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1903. Pp. xvii, 314.)

THE object of the joint authors of the present work is to carry in several volumes the history of political theory down to the early seventeenth century—"that is the time when, as it is thought, the specific characteristics of modern political theory began to take shape". It is to be strictly a "history of theory, not of institutions", though the authors "have frequently been compelled to examine the institutions in order to draw out more clearly the character of the theories which were actually current among those who reflected on the nature of political life".

The author of the present volume has brought to his work a thorough knowledge of the early church writers—certainly a necessary qualification for the period of which he treats—and has succeeded in expressing himself in such admirable and lucid English, free from all philosophical abstractions and obscurities, that at no time does his exposition fail to instruct and to interest the reader. This clearness is largely due to the admirable arrangement of the subject-matter and to the method of treatment, for the author deals not with theorists, but with theories. To some, no doubt, such a method will be unacceptable because it involves a certain amount of repetition and does not permit the reader, without some labor on his own account, to find the complete political system of any one of the writers referred to. The method

pursued, however, is infinitely preferable to that used in other works, where the treatment by authors in chronological order only serves to bring together a mass of encyclopedic and incoherent detail.

Part I or the introduction of the work devotes two chapters to the political theory of Cicero and Seneca. These are of such excellent merit that it is to be regretted that the authors did not see their way clear to giving several more introductory chapters to the precursors of Cicero in both Rome and Greece. The average reader will find difficulty in getting his bearings without first taking up some other work on political theory which deals with earlier writers.

Part II is devoted to the political theory of the Roman lawyers. It is in this part that the truly admirable quality of the method of treatment begins to show itself. The opening chapter deals with the theory of the law of nature. This is followed by one on slavery and property, and others on the theory of the civil law, the sources of political authority, and the political theory of Justinian's *Institutes*.

In part III, which has for its subject the political theory of the New Testament and the Fathers, the chapters are given the headings which those in the remainder of the work are evidently to retain. After a preliminary chapter on the New Testament, chapters follow on natural law, natural equality and slavery, natural equality and government, property, sacred authority of the ruler, authority and justice, and the relation of church and state. Part IV, treating of the political theory of the ninth century, is dealt with under almost the same chapter-headings as those in part III. Each chapter and each part is followed by a very useful summary, and at the foot of each page are given very lengthy extracts from the sources, which, if collected in one volume, would form a convenient source-book on the political theory of the period.

No claim could be made that the author has discovered any new theories or new theorists, but he has certainly put many matters in a new light. He is happy in possessing a certain aptness of expression in such phrases as these: "natural law and natural equality do not perhaps mean much more to them [the Roman lawyers] than evolution or progress mean to the modern politician" (p. 35); "The ninth century writers are Teutonic politicians, but they are obviously also disciples of the Western Fathers" (p. 197). Mr. Carlyle is equally skilful in making important distinctions and in summarizing the characteristics of great epochs. For example, he shows that though *jus gentium* and *jus naturale* were not distinguished by Gaius, Ulpian conceived of some difference between the two (pp. 36 ff.); that the reason for the preaching by the Apostles and early Church Fathers of such a strong theory of subjection to the civil powers lay in the dangerous tendency to anarchism among the Gentile converts (pp. 94, 97).

There are but few portions of the work which call for adverse criticism. On p. 63, the author states: "The mediæval theory of the social contract, . . . so far as we know, was first put forward definitely in the

end of the eleventh century." This is so general as to carry a wrong impression, and its truth is entirely dependent upon which one of the several meanings of the social contract the author has in mind. He is somewhat too mild in speaking (p. 124) of the early Christian defense of slavery. A knowledge of *How's Slaveholding not Sinful, Slavery the Punishment of Man's Sin*, published in our ante-bellum days, would have shown him how lasting and vicious that early defense was. In speaking of St. Gregory's theory of non-resistance to the temporal power he implies (p. 169) that St. Augustine was silent on the subject, thus overlooking entirely the latter's sermon in which he says: "non semper malum est non obedire præcepto cum enim dominus jubet ea, quæ sunt contraria deo, tunc ei obediendum non est". He fails to recognize (p. 211) that the source of Alcuin's description of primitive conditions of society obviously lies in the Prometheus myth. He might have called attention to the fact (p. 214) that Ine used the expression "king by the grace of God" almost a century before Charlemagne used it.

Few if any of the above criticisms could have been made had Mr. Carlyle seen fit to study carefully the best secondary works on the history of political theory instead of confining himself almost exclusively to a study of the sources. Throughout his work he seldom shows any familiarity with the researches of modern scholars in the field of political theory, and with but few exceptions he never refers to any secondary authorities. This is a glaring and inexcusable fault in an otherwise highly meritorious work.

JAMES SULLIVAN.

*The King's Household in England before the Norman Conquest.*

By LAURENCE MARCELLUS LARSON. [Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, No. 100. History Series, Vol. I, No. 2, pp. 55-211.] (Madison, Wisconsin: 1904.)

THIS monograph, which was submitted for the degree of doctor of philosophy at the University of Wisconsin, exhibits much more originality and power of research than the average doctoral thesis. It also displays a linguistic equipment and a lucid style such as are rarely found in dissertations presented by candidates for the degree of doctor of philosophy. To grapple successfully with a subject like the king's household in the Anglo-Saxon period requires much courage and learning; stray bits of evidence laboriously gathered from a great variety of sources, English and continental, must be skilfully pieced together and critically interpreted. This Dr. Larson has done with signal success. He has carefully exploited charters, laws, chronicles, sagas, lives of saints, and poetic monuments in quest of evidence bearing on his subject; and the result is a substantial contribution to our knowledge of Anglo-Saxon institutions.

He first gives us an account of the eorls, gesiths, and thegns, especially of their relations to the king. He believes that the eorl was



originally the leader of a *comitatus* and did not become an Anglo-Saxon official before the reign of Cnut, but in a foot-note on page 81 he intimates that such officials existed already in the tenth century. Though no strikingly new general conclusions are deduced regarding *gesiths* and *thegns*, the chapters on their status and relations to the crown are valuable, because many new details, drawn chiefly from Anglo-Saxon poetry, are presented. Our author doubts whether there were common *thegns* in distinction from king's *thegns* before the eleventh century (p. 100), but such subordinate *thegns* seem to be referred to in various passages cited by Schmid (*Gesetze*, 668) and perhaps in a letter written by Alcuin in 801 (*Monumenta Alcuiniana*, 623). Guilhiermoz's *Essai sur l'Origine de la Noblesse en France* (1902), the second chapter of which deals at some length with *thegns* and presents a novel view regarding *gesiths*, has escaped Dr. Larson's diligent examination of the literature of the subject; probably it came to hand too late for him to use.

After considering the relations of the nobles to the king, he treats of the various officers of the royal household. He believes that in the eighth century there was a court official called the king's reeve (*præfectus regis*), who resembled the Merovingian *major domus*, but the evidence in support of this view is not convincing. Most of the passages in which the title *præfectus regis* occurs may refer to reeves placed in charge of royal estates. There seems to be a reference to "the high reeve" in Edmund's Laws, III, c. 5, which has escaped Dr. Larson's attention, but it does not help to throw light on the functions of this obscure office.

In chapters v-vii, concerning the seneschal, butler, chamberlain, royal chaplains, chancellor, staller, and house-carls, we feel that we are on firmer ground, and with the aid of Norse sources Dr. Larson gives us many new facts. Of the principal household dignitaries we hear little before the tenth century, when the butler, chamberlain, and seneschal comprised "the inner circle of the royal household service". These palatine officials begin to assume prominence in the time of Athelstan. Royal chaplains appear frequently from the time of Bede onward, but some of the passages in which the king's priests are mentioned may refer to the ordinary parish priests, as in Alfred's Laws, c. 38. Dr. Larson believes that a royal chancery existed as early as the reign of Ethelred the Unready. To his list of writers who contend that such a chancery was unknown in England before the time of Edward the Confessor, the names of Brunner, Aronius, and Giry may be added. The reign of Cnut marks the appearance of the stallership and the house-carls. On these institutions our author, with the aid of Norse poems and sagas and the Danish histories of Svenö and Saxo, throws much new light. "There can be no doubt", he says (p. 149), "that the stallership was the highest dignity at the Old English court when the Anglo-Saxon period came to a close." The account of the house-carls, which is based on a critical study of all the available



sources, is particularly valuable. It is difficult, however, to reconcile the statement (p. 170) that such a corps existed in England in the first quarter of the tenth century, with the view that it "was unknown in England before the last great Danish invasion" (p. 154). Chapter viii deals with the lesser officials of the court; and the last chapter considers "to what extent the organization of the Anglo-Saxon court was influenced by Continental custom and what influence, if any, it, in turn, exerted on similar households of a later date".

We hope that Dr. Larson will continue his study of Anglo-Saxon institutions, for the investigation of which his knowledge of the Norse sources renders him eminently fitted. Among other things, we need a reliable general account of the influence of the Danes upon the development of English institutions, for the conclusions of Worsaae are not trustworthy and those of Steenstrup are inaccessible to most students of English history.

CHARLES GROSS.

*Innocent III, Rome et l'Italie.* Par ACHILLE LUCHAIRE, Membre de l'Institut. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1904. Pp. 262.)

THE author of this book is the well-known historian of the Capetian dynasty (987-1224). The most characteristic pope coming within the period he has made his own is Innocent III (1198-1216), except his still more interesting predecessor Gregory VII (1073-1085). But Luchoire has attempted to write not a life of Innocent III, but a monograph on this pope's relations with Rome and Italy in general. His first chapter deals with the advent of the pope, and is lively reading, his second with the Roman commune, and we get a vivid impression of the sharp contrast between the clerical corruption and the longing of the people to be rid of the corrupt court. In chapter three we enter into the troubles of the pope in his attempt to impose the leaden yoke of the church on the proud necks of republican Italy. Freedom had given forth her rallying-cry, but the papacy was not prepared to grant the people any liberty. The chapter recounts these squabbles at rather tedious length. Sometimes the pope carried his point, but often miserably failed. Chapter four is more interesting. It deals with the effort of the pope to keep the kingdom of the Two Sicilies in subjection and to do his duty by his very independent ward, the young emperor Frederick II (1194-1250). On page 183 he utilizes with proper credit the matter relating to the capture of Palermo unearthed by Karl Hampe in the Bibliothèque Nationale and published in December, 1901. The fact comes out in the only foot-note or reference in the volume. The last chapter is the most interesting of all. It gives a graphic and very amusing account of the court of Innocent III, and of the pope's method of doing business. The poor man had no show there and the rich were fleeced. The money which Innocent III extorted was lavishly spent on deeds of charity and on splendid structures, and the conscience of the pope was easy. Luchoire tells at great length one of the many negotiations which required the patience of Job and the riches of Solomon

to carry through. It is the story of the successful efforts of Thomas de Marleberge, of whom we may read in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, which, by the way, to its infinite credit, prints a small volume of errata and thus honestly owns to errors and corrects them.

The vast correspondence of Innocent III was doubtless the source of this volume of Luchaire. We wish he had so stated, and that he had given references, as the correspondence of Innocent fills three volumes of the Migne reprint. The absence of such apparatus may have been due to the publisher who probably put the yellow paper cover on the book and made it look like a novel. It is, however, anything but fiction, being the work of a scholar who has gone to the sources for his facts, though he does excel many novelists in the number of good stories he has to relate of this lively pope, who wanted to have his finger in every pie and felt perfectly competent to rule the universe. Luchaire restricts himself to one land, but manifestly the pope who in this volume is found assigning husbands to marriageable females and tongue-lashing into silence refractory Italian villages and towns, is the same as he who in his world-politics browbeat Philippe Auguste of France, Alfonso IX of Castile, Peter of Aragon, and the more familiar John of England. Petty beyond comparison were many of the matters submitted to "the Oracle", as Luchaire calls Innocent III, but answers on all topics were forthcoming and, thanks to the letters having been dictated, they cost the honest, patient, and well-meaning pope no great amount of time.

What Friedrich Hurter, the classic historian of Innocent III, could not find, Luchaire, more fortunate, presents, namely, a contemporary portrait of this pope—in fact two, one from a mosaic and one from a fresco. It is to be regretted that the third contemporary portrait is not given. Luchaire has an interesting excursus on the portraits of Innocent III and thus brings this valuable book to a fitting close.

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON.

*Die Doppelhehe des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen.* Von Lic. WILLIAM WALKER ROCKWELL, Instruktor der Theologie in Andover, Massachusetts. (Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1904. Pp. xx, 374.)

THIS volume is one which will prove of value to the student of the Reformation period, for the episode with which it has to do was of far-reaching political significance, as well as curiously illustrative of a confusion of moral judgments brought about by the general unsettlement of hitherto accepted convictions incident to the Reformation age. That the foremost political leader among the princes who early supported the Reformation, the one among them all who saw most clearly the necessity of political coöperation for the advancement of the cause, and the one who had probably the most intelligent and appreciative sense of the principles for which the Reformation stood, should suddenly be isolated, and should become a divisive instead of a uniting force in Protestant ranks, being bent to the policy of Charles V. instead of standing as the

emperor's strongest opponent, and that these untoward results should have been the consequences of so unusual an act as a bigamous marriage, is certainly one of the tragedies of the Reformation age.

Mr. Rockwell's investigation has evidently been extremely painstaking and his study of the material on which a judgment of the course of events, or of the merits of the questions involved, can be based, is the most elaborate and exhaustive that has yet been attempted. The work is one in every way creditable to Mr. Rockwell's patience and scholarship, and, as such, is an excellent example of the application to a historical problem of careful methods of investigation. Many valuable, though relatively minor, modifications of earlier presentations are reached; yet the story, though far more adequately told, is still largely the same as it appears under the treatment of Professor Max Lenz in the fifth volume of the *Publicationen aus den königlichen Preussischen Staatsarchiven*. Mr. Rockwell is able to show, for the first time, that the famous Wittenberg Advice of December 10, 1539, was not composed by Melancthon, whose approval, with that of Luther, it bore, but was drafted by Justus Winter, a Hessian theologian, and that Melancthon did little more than copy out the form thus submitted to him in the interests of the landgraf. He is also able to demonstrate that, when rumors of the bigamy became spread abroad, Philip called together the leading nobles of Hesse and received their pledge to support him in event of attack. These may serve as types of a considerable number of additions to and corrections of the generally accepted narrative which Mr. Rockwell's scholarly acumen have enabled him to make.

Mr. Rockwell's work is in three parts. In the first, he takes up the history of the marriage itself from the earliest evidence now discoverable of the formation of the plan by the landgraf, through the course of the negotiations with Bucer, Luther, Melancthon, the Kurfürst Johann Friedrich of Saxony, and other nobles, to the actual marriage with Margaretha von der Sale, on March 4, 1540. From that event, he describes with graphic fullness the spread of the rumors of the bigamous union; the rising opposition, the landgraf's efforts to secure supporters, the difficult position of the reformers, the literary controversies which ensued, and Philip's settlement with the emperor. In his second part, Mr. Rockwell takes up the attitude of the Wittenberg reformers toward Philip's bigamy, and attempts to modify the critical judgment passed by Köstlin upon Luther that the Wittenberg divine's assent to Philip's second marriage was the greatest blot on Reformation history as well as on Luther's own life. He does not, indeed, undertake wholly to justify Luther's action, but to give it the kindlier explanation which he deems its due by exhibiting its motives in their true light more fully than has yet been done. That Luther should have consented that a marriage should secretly take place and then should have advised, as he did, at the meeting at Eisenach in July, 1540, four months after its occurrence, that a "good, strong lie" would be the best method of reply to the criticisms which the public

knowledge of the event excited, has always seemed a course of conduct difficult of justification. Mr. Rockwell shows plainly that Luther regarded the question from the point of view of a confessor charged with the spiritual good of the landgraf's soul. He did not look upon bigamy as a general right, but as a status that might be permitted in view of Old Testament example, under the special circumstances in which the landgraf was placed. Such permission, however, was only a dispensation before the bar of conscience and not a justification before the law. It was an allowance by a confessor to do something forbidden by law, which, nevertheless, it was for the good of the soul of the particular inquirer to do. The underlying theory was that the end of all law is the good of the soul; if that law hinders its good, exceptions may be permitted, but should not be made public, since their example would, in general, be bad. Hence Luther held himself warranted in advising a denial, as far as the general public was concerned, of facts which were well known to him in his confidential capacity. Curiously enough, from a modern Protestant point of view, Luther called to his aid, in this very question of denial of fact, the example of our Lord, saying, "I can do with good conscience as Christ in the Gospel; 'the Son knoweth not the day', and like a pious father confessor who shall and must say openly or before a court that he knows nothing regarding that which he is asked concerning secret confession, for what one knows secretly that cannot one know openly." It may be interesting to note, however, that this interpretation of Christ's declared ignorance of the day of judgment, as an intentional reticence justifying the secrecy of spiritual counsel, was not at all original with Luther, but was current in his day, for example, in the popular *Summa Angelica de Casibus Conscientiæ* of Angelo di Chiavasso, which Luther had read. Whether he can regard this explanation as affording any considerable measure of justification for Luther, the reader of Mr. Rockwell's volume will decide for himself. In the third section of his work, Mr. Rockwell presents a valuable discussion of the attitude of the Reformation age toward bigamy in general, involving an examination of the opinions of the German reformers on the matrimonial questions raised by Henry VIII; the views of Luther, Melancthon, and Bucer on bigamy; and the contemporary attitude of the Roman church, especially in regard to the power and extent of the right of papal dispensations.

WILLISTON WALKER.

*A History of the English Church.* Edited by the late Very Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, D.D., F.S.A., Dean of Winchester, and the Rev. WILLIAM HUNT, D.Litt. Volume V. *The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I (1558-1625).* By W. H. FRERE. (London: Macmillan and Company; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1904. Pp. xiii, 413.)

THE series to which this book belongs has established a reputation

for painstaking diligence in the use of original materials and the presentation of the subject in careful detail. Mr. Frere's volume conforms to this standard and contains much that is of interest and value to the student. The most important information of this detailed character is the statistical data about the English dioceses in 1563 compiled from manuscript sources. Doubtless the conscientious precision shown in determining the practice of various men and of men in various years in the matter of vestments and ceremonial will make some readers impatient, but such dull items may serve an end, negating, for example, the notion often entertained that many ritualistic practices of modern Anglicanism were not expressly enjoined in the time of Elizabeth simply because they were taken for granted. It is indeed to be regretted that some other modern questions are left unanswered. Recent discussions of the eucharistic doctrine show divergent views of the purpose and practice of those who gave form to the Elizabethan church. Frere offers no help in this matter, which Maitland, on the other hand, has made clear and significant in the *Cambridge Modern History* (II, 588). Maitland's treatment is illuminating because he sees English incidents in the framework of the general European situation; Frere has no constructive power. He seems not to have discovered general characteristics that make his period what some have called Pre-Laudian Anglicanism. The net impression left by the book is that only the Puritan party had a history of internal development and that the episcopal conception of the church was a fixed type. We learn nothing of the divergence of Bancroft from the principles of Jewel, Whitgift, and Hooker. We are left without explanation of the Elizabethan valuations of the articles or of the episcopal office. We learn nothing of the conscious and expressed convictions of those who gave the impress of their ideals to the church. We read that Jewel's *Apology* at once became a classic but obtain no notion of the thought of so influential a book. The mention of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* is even more meager and empty. The statement about its publication does not mention the doubts as to the genuineness of the posthumous books.

One result of this is that the presentation is one-sided. The Anglicanism of a later and more permanent type seems to be assumed as the necessary norm and the Puritans are false brethren intruding where they do not belong. It would be hard for the author to understand the protests of loyalty to the church of England on the part of the first Puritans of Massachusetts Bay. It is true that he studies to be just and for the most part freely recognizes the justification of the more temperate Puritan demands, yet an irritation which seems to grow as the book proceeds results in some rather sweeping aspersions, such as "truthfulness was never the Puritans' strong point". For the piety of Roman recusants Frere feels a reverence which no one will blame, but he has not taken pains to understand the Puritan type of piety. A little more power of *Anempfindung*, a little more social psychology, are needed for the study of a period when a nation became divided into

groups antagonistic in religion and politics. The author speaks slightly of the Puritans' "invasion of the liberty of men to enjoy innocent amusements on Sunday after service". Richard Baxter's account of a Jacobean Sunday will explain, however, the deep feeling of violated sanctity that drove the Puritan to his sabbatarian demand.

A few minor slips may be noted. The statement that Robert Browne's works have not been reprinted is made in ignorance of the *Old South Leaflets*, volume IV, and of the extracts in Hanbury and in Walker's *Credentials and Platforms of Congregationalism*. Robinson of Leyden is called James, and the Mayflower party is said to have landed "on November 11 at Plymouth Rock in Massachusetts".

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

*The American Nation: a History.* Edited by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART. Volume 2. *Basis of American History, 1500-1900.* By LIVINGSTON FARRAND, A.M., M.D., Professor of Anthropology, Columbia University. (New York and London: Harper and Brothers. 1904. Pp. xviii, 303.)

THE American nation as a political unit merely is a subject easily compassed by the historian, since its foundation lies not only within the period of written history but within the narrow limits of discovery and colonization. But he who would venture to treat the national history in its fuller significance must carry his researches beyond the limits of the Columbian period and over a vast range of subject-matter; he must consider the races and cultures of the Old World and their far-reaching influence in the New; he must have an intimate acquaintance with the New World, giving due attention to its configuration, its climate, and its resources, and must build up the background of his picture with the history of the American race. These are the elements that, in the view of Dr. Farrand, constitute the basis for the history of the American nation. The time may or may not have come for an adequate presentation of this history; the point of view may not yet be sufficiently remote for comprehensive vision, and the knowledge of the field and its complex phenomena may not be sufficiently complete; but our author has ventured upon the task, and the future must determine the wisdom of the undertaking and the degree of his success.

In the earlier chapters the author depicts in a simple and effective manner the physical features of the continent, characterizing the areas fitted for human occupancy and pointing out the bearing of the mountain masses, the deserts, and the rivers upon the distribution of populations. He shows how the invading race advanced to the conquest of the fertile valleys and the prairies, and how the aborigines were pushed inland along the waterways, across the passes, and over the portages, until the great habitable areas were almost completely wrested from their grasp—the special areas that had nurtured the native communities and developed their peculiar culture now became the focal centers for



the development of the new people and the new culture. Dr. Farrand summarizes the characteristics of the great areas of human activity, and enumerates (touching all too lightly on the mineral kingdom) the resources which, under the simple régime of the Indian, gave him an impulse toward civilization, and which in the stronger grasp of the white race created a new empire almost within the limit of a lifetime. Having covered this much of the ground, the author takes up the story of the native tribes as an essential part of the national history.

Chapter 5 is devoted to a consideration of the very important question of the antiquity of man in what is now the domain of the American nation. The geological evidence is dismissed with a few short paragraphs, leaving the impression that as yet little satisfactory proof of great antiquity has been found. Facts relied upon, when investigations began a few years ago, as fully establishing the existence of conditions of occupancy and culture parallel with those of Europe have more recently been given different and much simpler interpretations. Finds of artifacts in glacial gravels are too few and too imperfectly attested to carry conviction to the conservative student, and it is pointed out that caves which have for untold centuries offered free shelter to the tribes that have come and gone yield no trace of occupancy by others than the Indian tribes as known to us. It is justly considered, however, that the continent must have been occupied for thousands of years, the well-authenticated traces extending far back toward the period that witnessed the final retreat of the glacial ice beyond the northern limits of the Great Lakes. The mound-builders and the cliff-dwellers, about whom much misconception and error have insisted on clustering, are relegated to their proper place in the simple history of Indian occupation. In the light of the straightforward and judicious interpretations presented by Dr. Farrand, the cobwebs of early misinterpretation are swept completely away.

In chapter 6 a comprehensive glance is taken of the North American aborigines for the period beginning with 1500 and ending with 1900—the period during which they have been under the observation of our own race. The first requisite in this presentation is a classification of the extensive and complex phenomena involved, and it is pointed out that four groupings of the tribes are possible: by physical characters, by languages, by geographical areas, and by culture groups. The physical characters are varied and pronounced, but difficult to formulate in such ways as to serve as a basis for treatment. The grouping by languages is regarded as the most satisfactory for scientific discussion, but the tribes north of Mexico present such a wonderful diversity of tongues that fifty-seven distinct linguistic groups or families are recognized, making impossible a brief and comprehensive treatment on this basis.

It is believed by Dr. Farrand that a grouping by geographical areas is the most satisfactory for his purpose, the areas being such as have partly at least, through their peculiar characteristics of conformation



and resources, led to the development of somewhat decidedly distinctive phases of culture. By this method the number of groups may be large or small as the treatment demands. Seven are considered sufficient for the author's purpose, and are as follows: (1) the Eskimo; (2) the tribes of the north Pacific coast; (3) the tribes of the Mackenzie river basin and the high plateaus; (4) the tribes of the Columbia river and California; (5) the tribes of the great plains; (6) the tribes of the eastern woodlands; and (7) the tribes of the southwest and Mexico. The Eskimos occupy the northern shore-line of the continent from Bering sea to Greenland, and originally, it is surmised, extended south into New England. They are a people widely separated from the Indian in physical and mental characters, whose origin is not determined but whose adjustment to the Arctic environment and unique culture are among the most interesting and instructive lessons of aboriginal America. Contrasting strongly with the Eskimo, and presenting physical and cultural characters hardly less remarkable, are the tribes of the northwest coast. The third group, assembled in the great northern inland region, connects with the Eskimo on the north and extends from the coast ranges on the west to Hudson bay on the east; while the fourth occupies the basin of the Columbia river and the numerous minor valleys opening out to the Pacific in Oregon and California. The fifth group comprises the great warrior-hunter tribes of the inland plains, of which the Sioux are taken as the type; the sixth, the formerly powerful and strongly contrasting groups of the eastern woodland north and south, with which the English and French colonists had chiefly to deal; and the seventh, the many tribes of the southwest and Mexico, presenting numerous physical types and greatly diversified cultures. Of the three hundred or more tribes thus passed under review, few could even be mentioned and fewer described with any degree of fullness in the brief space allotted; but the perusal of these chapters will give the reader an excellent notion of the people as a whole, and of the groups as assembled in the great specialization areas of the northern portions of the continent. The chapters treating of the social organization of the tribes; houses, house life, and food quest; industrial life and warfare; religion, mythology, and art; and the character and future of the Indians, which follow, are excellent summaries of these subjects; and the final chapter, a critical essay on authorities, will prove to be of high value to the student.

Not without shortcomings such as necessarily result from the crowding of a vast subject within narrow limits (the faults of omission), this work is charmingly simple, direct, and comprehensive. The reader is not led into troublesome mazes of speculation, nor is he asked to skate on the thin ice of preconceived notions; the work must therefore prove a boon to schools and to the general public, which have too long been at the mercy of the hobby-rider and the sensation-monger. It is conservative and refreshingly healthy in tone throughout. The publishers

will be fortunate if the other volumes of the composite work to which this one belongs reach an equal standard of excellence.

W. H. HOLMES.

*The Spanish Conquest in America and its Relation to the History of Slavery and to the Government of Colonies.* By SIR ARTHUR HELPS. Edited by M. OPPENHEIM. (New York: John Lane. 1900-1904. Four vols., pp. xxxviii, 369; x, 365; xv, 400; xi, 374.

For a dozen years the book-buying market has been calling for a new edition of Helps's *Spanish Conquest*. The rapidly widening interest in the West Indies and in South America has found little satisfaction in the various manuals and volumes of personal misinformation which make up most of the bibliography of that part of the world. Helps remains as almost the only name which every one knows and with which confidence is associated. A mere reprint, however, would never have satisfied the public, much less the book-reviewers, and so the publishers have sought long and diligently for an editor. That only one edition has resulted apparently means two things: that there are very few people who pretend to know anything about early Spanish America, and that only one of these few has been willing to commit himself in regard to his opinion of the work of Sir Arthur Helps. The *Spanish Conquest* is so very good and so very bad, so delightful a presentation of the long-accepted versions of events, so perverse in its interpretation of many of the best-known happenings, so wearisome in its goodness, so uncritical in its acceptance of evidence, so admirable a specimen of the popular English historical attitude of the middle nineteenth century, that there is small wonder other students could not make up their minds how it ought to be edited. Mr. Oppenheim, who alone has ventured on the task, has succeeded most admirably in performing it in the spirit of his author. Just as Helps left the moral of the story to his readers' own insight, so his editor leaves them to find out for themselves what they think about Sir Arthur's historical method and manner. The notes correct some obvious mistakes, add considerable information from material published since the work first appeared, and otherwise elucidate the text, as on page 32 of the second volume, where Helps's statement, taken verbally from Las Casas, that a certain friar was a brother of the queen of Scotland, calls forth a list of all the brothers of all the Scottish queens who might have been living in 1516. It could not, of course, have entered the mind of Sir Arthur, any more that it has that of his editor, that the recognized heirs were sometimes not the only offspring of royalty, and that the half-brothers of queens, who very frequently rose to distinction in the religious orders, were not ordinarily included in the official genealogies. The editor not infrequently makes the mistake of saying too much, if he is not to say more, as where, on II, 56, he points out that Las Casas estimated the

width of South America as about double its actual extent, without adding that Sir Arthur, throughout this portion of his work, adopts the statements of Las Casas as his own, without comment or thought of verification.

The editor's important contribution, in the introduction and throughout the volumes, is the addition of cartographical material. Twenty-six of the most typical sixteenth-century maps are reproduced, in good size, and the introduction contains some suggestive remarks concerning the importance of finding out what were the contemporary notions of geographical location. The maps are not facsimiles, but are carefully redrawn so as to give the reader who is not accustomed to the documents themselves an excellent idea of the configuration and nomenclature of the originals. These redrawings would be distinctly more suitable for their purpose than actual facsimiles, if the editor had taken the trouble to provide some definite information regarding size, authorship, and significance. The absence of any such assistance, and the fact that the map of Venezuela faces the chapter on Honduras, that of Peru accompanies a chapter on the West Indies, and Chile one on Mexico, contribute to the feeling of sincerest regret that Mr. Lane has not succeeded in doing away with the need for any further reprinting of *The Spanish Conquest*.

G. P. W.

*The United States: a History of Three Centuries, 1607-1904.* In ten Parts. Part I. *Colonization, 1607-1697.* By WILLIAM ESTABROOK CHANCELLOR and FLETCHER WILLIS HEWES. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1904. Pp. xxiii, 533.)

IN this era of many-volume histories of the United States the first question that the reviewer must settle is the claim that the work may have to existence—not whether it will find a market, but whether it is fit to set before the intelligent reading public. In the present case it may be safely said that if the publishers of the book had submitted the manuscript of it to expert criticism before launching it into print, the review that follows would not have been written.

The publishers' announcement that the series of ten volumes is to constitute "a comprehensive narrative which shall cover the entire record of the national history and development" of the United States does not differentiate the work from its fellows in the same field. Neither do the proposed titles of the volumes indicate any deviation from the familiar text-book paradigm. Obedient to the general scheme, the introductory number of the series starts with Columbus and the Spaniards, turns aside for a glance at the Indians, then jogs stolidly along through wastes of arid description and platitudinous rhetoric, till 1697 bars the way.

The book is divided into four sections: "Population and Politics", "War", "Industry", and "Civilization". For the first, second, and

fourth sections Mr. Chancellor assumes the responsibility, and Mr. Hewes has prepared the third. In none of the four divisions is anything like a serious study of institutions attempted. So as to render the collocation of material rather more luminous, however, we are told (p. viii) that "the Second Section presents the record of war and of conquest, chiefly in their military phases", while the fourth section is devoted to "religion and morality, literature and art, education and social life". The unique separateness of treatment is so faithfully observed that the historical trains on this four-track road of American development rarely graze one another in passing. They appear to run quite free from any essential interconnection. This idea Mr. Hewes has emphasized, though unconsciously it would seem, in the first of several "historical perspectives" he has contributed. The "perspective" shows how American history has developed between 1607 and 1904 in four parallel columns set off with chromatic graphics, wherein Democratic politics and panics are colored blue, and Republican politics, education, wealth, and war are tinged with red—the whole properly surveyed with lines, chains, and rectangles. A glance at the "Civilization" column indicates the following as successive stages in the growth of American civilization: "Wigglesworth's 'Day of Doom'", "Import of Negroes encouraged"; "500 Negroes imported"; "Death for over 100 Crimes"; "Great 'Revival' colored people"; "Preachers may sell liquor"; "Rutgers College lottery"; "N. Eng.-Sexes-in pub. schools" [sic]; "Extensive 'Revival'" (twice); and the "Chicago fire"—the last without allusion to the historic cow! In addition to the "perspectives", the volume is provided with many small maps and diagrams, of which some are quite useful.

The bibliography is a hodgepodge of popular treatises, school textbooks and source-books, and encyclopedias, and includes at rare intervals a monograph of special value that does not seem to have been much used. The titles of the "authorities" are frequently misquoted, none of the references cite pages, and the notes are numbered consecutively. As the work progresses the number of notes steadily decreases, but the grade of intelligence displayed in their selection remains the same. Some of the notes are merely collections of references by number to previous notes. Had all of them consisted of digits, the result would not have been different, for they possess no value.

The index ranges itself alongside of the notes and references. It contains such interesting topics as: "Aboriginal mothers"; "Aborigines healthy"; "Conquest, not colonization"; "Cruelty and kindness"; "Kindness and cruelty"; "Intellectual wild man"; "New woman"; and "*Wander-lust*". William Penn is mentioned three times and Pocahontas seven. Arthur, Cervantes, Luther, and Gustavus Adolphus appear, but Robert Barclay, Theophilus Eaton, George Berkeley, the New England Confederation, and the Fundamental Laws of West Jersey are unheard of.

As for literary composition, whatever be the claims of the publish-

ers (p. xi), the book abounds in cheap comments, efforts at fine writing, and big words. The "unspeakable Turk" (p. 10) and the "Scythian pirate" (p. 10) of the fifteenth century jostle "had gone 'a-viking'" (p. 55) and "then there fell . . . a besom of cruelty and ruin" (p. 50). Speaking of the Northmen, the statement is made that, "in the course of the millenniums their flesh won the color of snow tinted by their own red blood; and their eyes changed to the color of the sky" (p. 53). "Climacteric" events (p. 39), "cataclysmic [sic] struggles" (p. 23), and "objurgated colonials" (p. 129) trip the reader up, and he falls sprawling over the "static" and "latent" Invincible Armada engaged in its deadly conflict with the "kinetic" and "dynamic" English fleet (p. 62). But when he has about recovered his equilibrium, the hapless reader falls again—this time into a slough of unexplained allusions, quotations of small pertinence, and trite digressions on European history. Teutonic origins are unctuously traced, Anglo-Saxon superiority is proclaimed from the fence-top, while the Jews, the Indians, and woman suffrage—with mistaken notions about Queen Elizabeth as the text—receive words of commendation, and the Roman Catholics a gratuitous fling or two. In this connection it is pleasant to learn that "by Columbus" "the Mediterranean was made an inland sea" (p. 23), and that the "untutored savages" were in the habit of arguing "post ergo propter" (p. 202).

Of the making of positive errors, misstatements, and slipshod phrases there is no end. To quote a few samples: we are told that the idea that the earth is round emanated from Constantinople after 1453 (pp. 11-12); that Verrazano was commissioned by Charles V of France (p. 37); and that King Arthur went to Iceland in the sixth century, on which occasion he "broke a path" in the ocean "never afterward wholly lost" (p. 56). The "marriage of Henry of York, the statesman-miser, with the beautiful and generous Elizabeth of Lancaster" (pp. 65, 68) matches "the long line of English kings, from Cedric" (p. 117) and the circumstance that the mother of William III "was Mary, daughter of Charles I., and sister of James I." (p. 323), whose "hybrid nature made him . . . 'the wisest fool in Christendom'" (p. 68). That James Stuart was "Earl of Albany in the Irish peerage" (p. 315) is an assertion not quite so surprising, perhaps, as the observation that "Holland had adopted the modern . . . calendar year centuries before the scholarship of England was sufficient to overcome the prejudices of Parliament" (p. 314). One would like to know, also, where Mr. Chancellor procured his estimate that the mines of Spain in America yielded sixty billions of dollars between 1492 and 1588 (p. 27).

When the author reaches American colonial history, the reader who would follow him becomes entangled in another mesh of mistakes. For instance, it is said that Bartholomew Gosnold organized the first Virginia Company (p. 96) and that the "governing council in England; consisting of twenty-five members", was "independent of the company of stock-holders" (p. 113). The Pilgrims are alleged to have

applied to the Dutch West India Company for permission to go to New Amsterdam (p. 197). The conduct of Thomas Morton and his company at "Merry Mount" is said to have "indicated . . . how near in time and in character the Englishman was to the Teutonic barbarian" (p. 227). It may be doubted whether a writ of *quo warranto* destroyed the charters of the Virginia Company in 1626, and of the Plymouth Company in 1635 (p. 237). The history of New Hampshire is so unimportant as to be dismissed with nineteen lines. An examination, finally, of the frame of government adopted in Pennsylvania in 1683 will show that the author's interpretation of the last article, to the effect that it "provided that an unconstitutional law was void unless passed by a vote of six out [of] seven" (p. 304), is not a commentary on the intelligence of Penn and his associates. Wrong dates, misspellings, and misuse of proper names and places are so common as to call for no special remark.

After the reader has escaped from the book he feels as if he had been almost "immolated in life-long confinement" (p. 118) and is inclined to agree with Lord Acton of "Oxford" (p. 33) that the "historic cycle" which he has just traversed is indeed one "laden with storm and havoc" (p. 34) in all the essentials that count for ability in historical writing.

WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.

*Memoirs of the Martyr King: being a Detailed Record of the Last Two Years of the Reign of His Most Sacred Majesty King Charles the First (1646-1648/9).* By ALLAN FEA. (London and New York: John Lane. 1905. Pp. xxi, 278.)

MR. ALLAN FEA, who has already told us much about the personal life and adventures of Charles II and of his son, the Duke of Monmouth, undertakes in the present work to give a detailed account of the last two years of the life of Charles I. The author's own contribution is included in the first two chapters, which together occupy about one-fourth of the volume. The first and most important is a diary or chronological itinerary tracing the movements of the king from his escape from Oxford, April 27, 1646, to his execution at Whitehall, January 30, 1648, Mr. Fea's chief purpose being to fix dates missing in the memoirs which follow. The second chapter is devoted to a description of the personal relics of the last days of the ill-fated monarch. The bulk of the volume, however, consists of a collection of narratives of persons in attendance about the king during the period in question, namely, Dr. Michael Hudson, Sir Thomas Herbert, Major Huntington, Sir John Berkeley, John Ashburnham, Sir Henry Firebrace, and Colonel Edward Cooke. Among these narratives the *Threnodia Carolina* of Sir Thomas Herbert is first published in its original form; since the editor has found that the edition of 1702, from which those of 1711 and 1813 are merely exact reprints, differs considerably both from the

original manuscript and from a copy in Herbert's handwriting which has also been preserved. The appendix contains Colonel Edward Whalley's account of Charles I's escape from Hampton Court palace, November 11, 1647, Colonel Hammond's letter to the Houses of Parliament concerning the attempted escape of Charles from Carisbrooke castle, May 28, 1648, and extracts from Lilly's autobiography and his *Life and Death of King Charles I*. William Lilly, it will be remembered, was the astrologer whom the Royalists, with the privity of the king, consulted as to whether he should escape from Hampton Court and whether he should sign the propositions of Parliament. The work concludes with pedigrees of the Worseley, Ashburnham, Legge, Cooke, and a branch of the Berkeley families, to whom, by the way, the dedication is addressed.

Both the chronological introduction and the editing of the various narratives are marked by an extended and minute acquaintance with topography, genealogy, chronology, manuscript sources, and relevant printed materials—in short, by all of the antiquarian equipment, and enthusiasm as well, requisite for an undertaking of this character. In the interest of clearness, however, it might have been advisable to add a summary table of dates and a chart indicating the course of the king's wanderings during the interval treated. Although a great service has been rendered in bringing together these interesting materials in a single place, the expense of the edition, limited to three hundred and fifty copies, will keep it beyond the reach of most students.\* On the other hand, its rich and tasteful externals should make it a joy for collectors to possess. The cover, of brown leather stamped with the royal arms in gold, is from a design on the king's Bible which he used on the scaffold and gave at his death to Bishop Juxon. There are upwards of a hundred illustrations, mostly in photogravure, of portraits, relics, views of ancient buildings, and reproductions of old paintings and engravings; the frontispiece, a picture of Charles from a painting by Lely after van Dyke in the Dresden Gallery, is done in colors. A detailed discussion of these illustrations would be beyond the scope of this review, but it should be said that, while occasional small criticisms might be made, the industry and knowledge of the author combined with the skill of the publishers have secured pictorial results deserving of the highest praise.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

*The Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell, with Elucidations by Thomas Carlyle.* Edited by S. C. LOMAS, with an introduction by C. H. FIRTH, M.A. (London: Methuen and Company. 1904. Three vols., pp. lxii, 523; xii, 557; lxii, 523.)

MRS. LOMAS's edition of Carlyle's *Cromwell* is undoubtedly definitive. Mrs. Lomas is a scholar possessing sound sense, experience, and unusual familiarity with the period. She has gone to the originals of the



letters and speeches where the originals exist, and as near to the originals as possible where these do not exist. She has added a large number of letters hitherto unpublished, and has contributed critical notes of unusual value.

Nevertheless, it is a pity that she should have thought it necessary to reëdit Carlyle's text. She would have rendered a much more acceptable service to scholarship by producing an entirely new work. Scholars do not need and do not wish Carlyle's comments. Moreover, to give Carlyle's text, no matter how thoroughly annotated, is to perpetuate an untrue portrait of Oliver Cromwell. For those who are not scholars, the old Carlyle was good enough. If, however, she felt it necessary to reëdit Carlyle, it would have been better to include in the body of the work all the new letters and speeches, instead of relegating them to a supplement. If one wishes to be sure that he has all the information given in this collection concerning any particular period in Cromwell's life, he must consult first Cromwell's text, secondly Cromwell's appendix, thirdly Mrs. Lomas's supplement. To state this fact is, it would seem, to condemn Mrs. Lomas's method. All the letters and speeches could easily have been included in the body of the work by adopting a system of double numeration.

Criticism is justified, moreover, in regard to Mrs. Lomas's treatment of Carlyle's text in the speeches, though not in the letters. In the speeches she has allowed many of Carlyle's alterations to stand, and has not always indicated what these alterations are. An excellent illustration is found in the speech numbered iv by Carlyle. The present editor gives this "almost as it stands in the old pamphlet". Why "almost"? As it now stands, it is neither Cromwell nor Carlyle. Collating Mrs. Lomas's text with that of Stainer, who also prints from the old pamphlet, we find over fifty variations between the two, not counting differences in paragraphing, punctuating, the use of italics, or quotation marks. This seems inexcusable, and the more so as Mrs. Lomas points out that the speech as printed was revised by Cromwell himself. It should consequently have been given precisely as Cromwell left it. The variations in Mrs. Lomas's text are indeed insignificant, but that only makes them the more inexcusable. The truth is that all editing of material for the use of scholars, except the very slightest, is an offense. What a scholar demands is the text as nearly as possible as it exists in the originals. He can do his own paragraphing, his own punctuating, his own italicizing; he can make his own comments, and add his own embellishments. Mrs. Lomas should have taken the editing of the *Clarke Papers* as her model.

Some minor criticisms may be offered. Mrs. Lomas should have omitted letter CC. Firth has shown that this letter cannot be genuine, and Mrs. Lomas evidently agrees with him. If she allowed this to remain, it was hardly consistent to omit the Squire Papers, though of course the position of these in the appendix lent itself much better to omission. Another matter of some importance is the apparent failure of

the editor to use the reports of the representative of the Great Elector. These would have furnished at least one characteristic speech of Cromwell. Mrs. Lomas should have said that the supplement contains four new letters from Oliver to Henry Cromwell, instead of three. All letters of Cromwell, no matter how similar to others, should either have been printed in full, or the variations noted, instead of merely calendaring them; in the editor's note, and again on III, 313, the name Downing is given where Downhall is meant. Firth's introduction is all that could be asked.

R. C. H. CATTERALL.

*The Adventures of King James II of England.* With an introduction by the Right Rev. F. A. GASQUET, D.D. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1904. Pp. xliii, 502.)

THE anonymous author of the *Adventures of King James II*, supposed to be Thomas Longueville, has already entered more than once the field of seventeenth-century biography. Among his previous publications *The Life of a Conspirator (Sir Everard Digby)*, *The Life of Sir Kenelm Digby*, and *Rochester and other Literary Rakes of the Court of Charles II* will recall the character of his prevailing interests, which are personal rather than political. Likewise, in the present work the aim is not to study James as a king, and still less to trace again the events of those stormy years which culminated in his expulsion from the throne, but rather to tell the story of those less-known sides of James's life in which he appeared to most advantage, as a soldier, as a sailor, and as a conscientious and efficient administrator.

Although there is ample evidence of familiarity with the contemporary memoirs of the period, the book is practically based on the celebrated *Life of James II*, compiled by order of the old Pretender from the king's own memoirs, and first published by the Rev. J. S. Clarke in 1816. Not only has it been the author's chief reservoir of facts, but it has largely colored his estimate of the character and motives of James. Strangely enough, although Ranke in a masterly criticism of this work has shown its untrustworthy character by comparing it in places with the extracts made by Carte and Macpherson from James's original memoirs and published by the latter in his *Original Papers*, the present writer makes no mention of these valuable fragments, even though he occasionally quotes from another work of Macpherson's, *The History of Great Britain*, etc. Indeed, in referring to that portion of James's memoirs relating to his experiences under Turenne, which is printed in volume II of De Ramsay's *History of Viscount Turenne*, he states that this collection "is the only portion of James' manuscript *Memoirs* that we have, at any great consecutive length, and the substantial agreement of it with the *Memoirs* edited by Clarke goes far to show the care, accuracy, and trustworthiness of the compiler" (p. 57.

note 2). On the sides of James's career with which the author is chiefly concerned it is only fair to say that Clarke's *Memoirs* are a much less unsafe guide than are the parts which relate to his political activity in England.

The narrative is clear and fairly readable, considering the dullness of the man with whom it deals, and while it keeps James's best side uppermost, and while it exhibits frankly Roman Catholic sympathies, the facts, except here and there where Restoration politics comes in, are presented accurately and fairly.

Although political questions are touched on only slightly, the bias against the party opposed to James is all too evident. Aside from occasional references to Macaulay, usually for a partizan purpose, Lingard is the only general historian used; and many particular instances might be cited of the author's eagerness in the cause of James and his party and of his animus against their enemies. Arlington is said (p. 202) to have worked for the Test Act out of hostility to the Duke of York, when it seems more likely that his aim was to get rid of Clifford in order to succeed him as Lord Treasurer. Mr. John Pollock's evidence concerning the real designs of the Roman Catholics in the latter half of Charles's reign, as distinguished from those mendaciously attributed to them by Oates, is hastily dismissed as unconvincing (p. 243). Halifax, because of his desire to limit the power of James in the event of his succession, is not given adequate credit for his share in defeating the Exclusion Bill.

Keen on exonerating James from any responsibility for the "Bloody Assize" of Jeffreys, the author states (p. 322) that it is recorded in the *Lives of the Norths* that when Lord North informed the king of the excessive severities of Jeffreys, James sent orders to stop them. No page reference is given for this statement: it occurs on p. 391 of Jessopp's edition of 1890; but a learned note is appended, which the author does not mention, showing that, since North died on September 5 and since Jeffreys did not open his assize at Dorchester till September 3, it is unlikely that North made the remonstrance attributed to him. Moreover, the fact that James appointed Jeffreys chancellor after North's death rather contradicts the conclusion that "it is clear that when he realized Jeffreys' cruelty, he strongly disapproved of it". The delight of the dissenters at James's Declaration of Indulgence does not seem to have been so general as the author implies (p. 337), and in spite of the very broad views on toleration attributed to James in Clarke's *Life* (II, 145-151), which, by the way, might have been cited, many will question the assertion (p. 357) that "there is no reason, again, for supposing that he only relieved all nonconformists, with the object of giving relief to the Catholics". James's truthfulness is constantly insisted upon, though he certainly did not observe the spirit at least of the promises made at his accession, and much of the blame for the most disastrous measures of his brief reign is ascribed to his too generous trust in unworthy men. Always less dissolute, except in

the matter of sexual purity, than those about him, emphasis is laid on the fact that James's last years were a pattern of personal morality and devoutness.

Although we have had to pass some adverse criticism on a side of the work where the general reader might be misled, we ought to be grateful to the author for a book which, if not strikingly interesting, is nevertheless useful for bringing out features of James's character which are not in general adequately recognized. It is worthy of note that Mr. J. R. Tanner in his recently edited *Catalogue of the Naval Manuscripts in the Pepysian Library*, volume I (Navy Records Society, 1903), has furnished additional proof that the period of progress in the administration of naval affairs from 1660 to 1688 was due, to a considerable extent, to the influence of James, thereby conclusively refuting Macaulay's unjust reflection on his capacity in this field of work. His able assistant Pepys was not Secretary of the Admiralty during the Dutch War of 1665-1667, as stated by our author (p. 161), but Clerk of the Acts. Father Gasquet's introduction, devoted mainly to a consideration of James's conversion and the consequences which it involved, argues what few will deny, that, in spite of his continued immorality, his change of faith was due to conviction rather than to policy. The book is well bound and exceptionally well printed; the illustrations are happily chosen, and the analytical table of contents adds to its usefulness for reference.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

*Friedrich der Grosse und der Conflict mit seinem Vater.* Von RHEINHOLD BRODE. (Leipzig: C. Hirzel. 1904. Pp. x, 486.)

It is no enviable task to be obliged to review a book like the above. It is written by a professor in a German university of high standing; it has all the appearance of a most thorough and learned work, with copious notes and citations; the numerous printed authorities quoted are of the highest order, and the author claims to have used manuscript material; the work is evidently the result of great industry. Yet so faulty is the arrangement, so slight is the thread of connection running through the whole, so minimal—at least from the historical student's point of view—are the results, so inflated and pretentious is the style, that the most lenient critic could find little to praise. The author is something of a mystic. "You cannot", he says when describing the few events that are known of the early days of Frederick the Great, "master the fullness of individual life with the incorporeal word, with definitions and formulas. But the little that has been said, *had* to be said. It is true these explanations offer little perhaps to the abstract thinker, and nothing at all to the bald weigher of facts. But to the soul-knower (*dem Seelenkundigen*) they mean much."

The title of the work is *Frederick the Great and the Conflict with his Father*; the subtitle, "a Contribution to the inner History of the Monarchy of Frederick William I". Yet not until page 259 do we

reach the page-heading "Germans of the Conflict with the Father"; and after the conflict is over we have to go back to Albert the Bear in a chapter entitled "Sum and Substance of Prussian Civilization". The earlier chapters deal for the most part with events that took place long after the conflict; thus no less than 110 pages are given to the general diplomatic and military history of Europe between 1740 and 1748.

One might understand an endeavor to show that the Frederick of the Austrian Succession war had become what he was in consequence of the bitter experiences of the years 1730 and 1731. But no such attempt is made. During this whole long digression into European history Frederick's name is scarcely mentioned. One is perfectly at sea as to the meaning of it all until, at the end, we are told that the author has heretofore been keeping the Prussian king (who has, according to the strange economy of the book, yet to be born) "behind the scenes, as it were, looking on at the grandiose drama of this seven-year struggle"; and all that has preceded is simply "intended to constitute, in forcible synthesis, the sharply outlined pedestal on which his image rises". "Now, however," exclaims the author, "it is time to bring upon the stage as protagonist the most active and boldest of princes and to look face to face on this monarch and his state." Incredible as it may seem after such an exordium, we are now plunged into a chapter on the "Essence and Value of Absolute Monarchy", and after sixty pages "the most active and boldest of princes" has only just seen the light. "Ein Glück nun dass er da war", is the author's own commentary (p. 224), though possibly intended in a different connection. The passage in which he speaks of what might have been Frederick's first impressions, had he had any, is characteristic of Brode's style. He tells of "high-coifed, silk-robed dames", of "tight-laced, copper-faced officers", of the "corpulent, tempestuous father", of the "majestic, amiable mother", and of the "warm-hearted little sister", and concludes: "such were the personages from one to the other of whom the little prince allowed his astonished, delicious, blue, childish, giant eyes to wander".

Brode says in his preface that his book owes its origin to the famous controversy of Lehmann and Delbrück against Naudé and Koser regarding the causes of the Seven Years' War. He has come to the conclusion that what is now needed is not a further threshing out of the old field but "psychological analysis of the great king". He implies that Dilthey's experiments in the direction of descriptive and psychological analysis have not been carried further because most men lack the requisite "fineness of perception" (*Bewusstseinsverfeinerung*). But he, Brode, now proposes to undertake just such analytic study with regard to Frederick's character and to make clear his motives in connection with the vicissitudes of European statecraft. This again seems to be an unmeaning promise, for no such analytic study is apparent. The narrative goes on for scores of pages as though Frederick never existed, and we are only occasionally brought back to him by some

sentence such as this: "it has been necessary to let our glance sweep the horizon of his youthful life to see how he was affected by environmental circumstances and events".

Perhaps the best pages in the book are those devoted to Grumbkow. Here the current idea that the Prussian minister was nothing but a paid spy of Austria is attacked. But the author runs away from every difficulty. That Grumbkow received a yearly pension from Austria is asserted by Koser on the strength of accounts handed in by Seckendorf to Prince Eugene. Brode simply remarks, "the proof that Grumbkow received a pension has not yet been furnished". Altogether the book is, in itself, as much of a psychological problem as Brode claims to be the case with Frederick's character.

ERNEST F. HENDERSON.

*Frederick the Great and the Rise of Prussia.* By W. F. REDDAWAY, M.A. [Heroes of the Nations.] (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1904. Pp. xi, 368.)

MR. REDDAWAY's history of Frederick is likely to be of use to students of this period for the reason that he is thoroughly up-to-date with his authorities. He has used the *Political Correspondence* which is in course of publication, and he has also read to advantage Koser's second volume. His accounts of battles are clear and vivid, and the little maps that show the disposition of the troops are a boon to the reader. The style in general is good.

With the arrangement of the book there is cause to quarrel, although the subtitle, "the Rise of Prussia", is somewhat disarming. Yet it surely is disproportionate, in a biography of Frederick, that more than seven-eighths of the volume should be concerned with the period anterior to 1763, although actually that date marks but the central point of the reign. Moreover in a work on a "Hero of the Nation" one has a right to expect a little less general military and diplomatic history, and a little more study of personality. Even Frederick's outward appearance is scarcely done justice to by the casual remarks that his ablutions were few, his uniform usually faded and covered with snuff, his boots "through neglect, of a reddish color", his bearing "stern and caressing by turns", his voice clarion, his eye commanding. We have definite descriptions of him which might better have been quoted, like that of the Marquis de Bouillé, who saw him as an old man. As to any real weighing or study of character such as we find, for instance, in L. Paul-Dubois, *Frédéric le Grand d'après sa Correspondance Politique*, no such attempt is made at all. Yet Frederick's character, with its contradictions and idiosyncrasies, is very interesting indeed. Even his threats and insults are attenuated when we see him so conscious of his own shortcomings as to inquire anxiously about new ambassadors whether they can stand occasional outbursts or not, handing document after document to Podewils with instructions to tone down the violence of their language, and taking great pains to explain



to an offended Mardefeld that his one and only object in scolding him had been to incite him to greater efforts. And Reddaway's treatment of the literary and philosophic side of Frederick's life is absolutely inadequate; all the references to Voltaire together fill little more than a page, while d'Argenson and d'Argens are not even mentioned.

The weakest part of the whole book is that which deals with Frederick before his accession. Reddaway shares with Tuttle a contempt for King Frederick William I which makes his narrative descend to the level of mere invective. He has, for instance, no more real ground for saying that the king's "mixture of fervent piety and immorality suggests that he was hardly sane", or that he "drank himself to death before he was fifty-two", than Tuttle had to speak of the "sour beer" and "stale tobacco" of the famous tobacco parliament. If the beer was sour, it was not Frederick William's fault, for we have his admonition to twenty-seven towns of Prussia to bring the quality of their beer up to that of the beer of Potsdam; while the charge of immorality can only be traced to a scurrilous remark of Wilhelmina and is in direct contradiction to a mass of other evidence. Altogether Wilhelmina is given too much credit by Reddaway, as also by Tuttle. Since Droysen proved that all the letters cited in her memoirs are fabricated, her credibility has been more and more shaken, and there are German scholars of repute who go so far as to consider her utterly unfit to be quoted as an authority except where her statements can be controlled.

In his description of Frederick's attempt at flight Reddaway has made several careless statements. Katte was not one of the confederates who "tried to steal from the royal camp at dawn and to ride into France" (p. 32). He had remained in Berlin, and it was there that he was arrested. Keith was Frederick William's page, not Frederick's. Frederick did not, on October 11, 1730, "declare to the commission that he was ready to renounce the succession". On the contrary, he answered, to quote the protocol of Grumbkow, that "life was not so very dear to him, but his royal Majesty would not be so ungracious to him as all that". Finally it cannot be said that "Frederick had neither acted nor *tried to act* in collusion with any foreign Power". Katte confessed that among letters that he had destroyed there had been one from George of England, while Frederick himself avowed that the English special envoy, Hotham, had known of the intended flight. In fact Frederick had tried in every way to make Guy Dickens, the regular envoy, promise him that England would grant him asylum, and Dickens had been obliged to threaten him with the retraction of a promise to pay his debts, which debts, again, Frederick had placed many thalers too high in order that he might have funds for his undertaking.

ERNEST F. HENDERSON.



*The Writings of Samuel Adams.* Edited by HARRY ALONZO CUSHING. Volume I. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1904. Pp. xiv, 447.)

THE editor of this volume properly says in the preface that the writings of no one of the leaders of the American Revolution form a more complete expression of the causes and justification of that movement than do the writings of Samuel Adams. Such a collection has long been needed for the study of the movements of the decade before the battle of Lexington, as the only available material was to be found in the three-volume *Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams* (1865), by his great-grandson, William V. Wells. Of course much of the material available for the edition of the writings was to be found in such volumes as the *Massachusetts State Papers*, and doubtless Bancroft made use of many if not most of the materials that are here gathered together; for the papers collected by Samuel Adams Wells, which formed the basis of the *Life* by William V. Wells, were transferred to Bancroft, and on the death of the historian went to the Lenox Library. The student and the reader of the Revolutionary era, however, has had to take much for granted and has not had the opportunity of examining critically the work of the foremost democratic leader of the great democratic movement of the last century. We now have the promise of a collection of the most important public papers, carefully edited and printed in the attractive form in which the writings of other American statesmen have been published by the Putnams.

The present volume covers the period from 1765 to 1769, inclusive. We are given nothing before the date of the Stamp Act, except one paper dated May, 1764—the instructions of the town of Boston to its representatives in the general court. It is true that the worshipful diligence of Wells did not unearth much of importance for the early years of Adams's career; but the two or three things which Wells did print are perhaps worth including in any collection of Samuel Adams's writings. Nearly all the papers in this volume are of a distinctly public character. Probably, as the editor says, prudence as well as necessity dictated the destruction of many of Adams's papers, but it seems strange that almost no letters of a personal character worthy of publication have been discovered, and almost no letters written in an informal, friendly way on matters of public concern and interest—such letters as are found in abundance in the writings of Madison, Jefferson, and Washington. This failure to discover such material is presumably not to be attributed to any negligence on the part of the editor, but in itself helps to characterize the character and conduct of Adams. The townspeople of Boston were his correspondents, and he addressed them with frankness, suggestion, irony, insinuation, and semi-serious, heavily-laden humor in the pages of the newspapers of the day, which were largely made up of contributed articles of this kind and plenteous advertisements.

The papers presented in this volume are brought together from many places. Some come from the manuscript collections of the Earl of Dartmouth, some from the collections in the Lenox Library, some from the *Massachusetts State Papers*, some from the *Life* by Wells, some from the *Prior Documents* and other printed sources. Mr. Cushing has had the task of gathering his material as well as editing it. The patience used in gathering the writings is evident, but it is plain too that the editor has undertaken a task more puzzling than that confronting any other of those that have edited the writings of the early statesmen. The editors of the writings of Washington, Madison, Jefferson, and Monroe found themselves troubled with an embarrassment of manuscript riches, from which they could select the most significant papers. Mr. Cushing has had to seek for his materials. He has had moreover the task of determining whether papers commonly attributed to Adams were really the handiwork of the great radical or have simply been attributed to him by admiring patriots and by reverential descendants. How carefully this work has been done we are not allowed to know. For example, on page 166 we are informed only that a paper appears in *Prior Documents*; numerous articles are printed from the Boston newspapers, absolutely without editorial comment. It is easy enough to gather from Wells that every trenchant newspaper communication came from the irreconcilable Adams and that every report from a committee of which he was a member was written by the fluent pen of this first among American politicians. But in volumes such as these we are entitled to a short statement of the evidence on which the authenticity of a paper is decided. When any one of the documents here inserted is not copied from the manuscript, and when the whereabouts of the original manuscript is unknown, it is incumbent on the editor to give the reason for including the papers. In many cases he may be able only to say that the article has been commonly attributed to Adams or that it bears the marks of his hands, but that much at least we are entitled to.

The whole history of Adams is affected in large degree by the questions here stated. Much applause has been given him for his acumen and his persistence; and in some measure this reputation and our estimate of him rest on his papers and his letters to the press; and yet the authorship of many of these letters seems to be inferred only from the fact that Adams was persistent and acute. Of course that sort of reasoning can go on forever, and any one of us could be made out the greatest of men. Everything included here is so desirable for an understanding of the Revolutionary movement that the reviewer has not the courage to advise the omission of papers the authenticity of which is in doubt, but he does express the desire that succeeding volumes will make plain the basis of inclusion and that work of such importance as this should not be subjected to so serious a criticism.

*The Bernards of Abington and Nether Winchendon: a Family History.* By Mrs. NAPIER HIGGINS. Volumes III and IV. (London: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1904. Pp. x, 363; ix, 342.)

WITH the disappearance of Governor Bernard from the stage in volume II of this series it seemed probable that the career of the Bernards, whether of Abington or of Nether Winchendon, would be of little interest to American readers. Such, however, is not the case. Setting aside as of minor consequence the story of Sir Scrope Bernard's life, the greater part of which was spent in public service, much of it in fact as a member of Parliament, the attention of the reader will be fastened upon the many philanthropies with which the name of Sir Thomas Bernard is associated. Those who have read the second volume of this series will remember that Thomas Bernard, a son of the governor, was summoned from Harvard College to serve in Boston as the private secretary of his father. This Thomas Bernard was our philanthropist; and the limits imposed upon this review would not permit even a list of the many benevolent works with which his name was connected. It is interesting to note that he was quick to appreciate the value of the investigations of that distinguished native of Massachusetts, Count Rumford, with whom he was associated in the formation of the Royal Institute, and from whose published works he made free use of that part devoted to the subjects of food and fuel, the value of which to-day is seldom recognized at its true worth. At the Foundling Hospital in London, of which he was treasurer, he adopted the Rumford grates and established a Rumford eating-house. This charity had been founded by Thomas Coram, a name intimately associated with Massachusetts history, and the hospital had a short time before acquired an estate near Bernard's Bloomsbury residence. To this estate Bernard repaired, and there with his wife he lived for many years in order that he might directly oversee the lives of the children in the care of the institution. His varied interests comprehended, among other topics, prevention of mendicity; improvement of the treatment of prisoners; protection of chimney-sweeps and factory children; and providing facilities for vaccination—in short, there was no question under consideration in his day bearing upon the amelioration of the condition of the poor and the oppressed with which his name was not associated. Moreover his extraordinary power of interesting others in his work led to conspicuous success in the formation of societies, and caused a contemporary writer to remark that he had made benevolence fashionable. Through copious extracts from the many publications of Bernard the author of these volumes has succeeded in giving an idea of the life of this remarkable man.

A pathetic interest attaches to the story of Sir John Bernard, who was left by Sir Francis in America, in supposed wealth, he being the designated heir of the vast grants of land which the governor had accu-

mulated during his official career. The confiscation of Sir Francis Bernard's American property during the governor's life dissipated the prospective patrimony of the young man and left him without means. He inherited nothing but the empty title attaching to the baronetcy, which after the brief and apparently unsuccessful career of its bearer devolved upon Thomas, the next brother in succession. On the death of Sir Thomas the baronetcy passed to Scrope; to-day the title is extinct. Sabine gives brief sketches of the lives of Sir John and Sir Thomas.

Bearing in mind that this is a "family history", it may be said that the author has justified its publication. The typography of the volumes is excellent, the proof-reading unexceptionable. Admirable tables of contents preface each volume and head each chapter. A well-prepared index for the two volumes under consideration is to be found at the end of volume IV.

ANDREW MCFARLAND DAVIS.

*A History of Education in the United States.* By EDWIN GRANT DEXTER, Ph.D., Professor of Education in the University of Illinois. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1904. Pp. xxi, 656.)

THIS book is very attractive in its make-up, but it will prove disappointing to those who hold that the history of education should be history. It is split up into monographs, giving separate accounts of the development of education in its different aspects. Ten times the reader is taken back to colonial beginnings to trace the isolated chronology of some part of our educational system. This is in keeping with the declared purpose of the author to present a mass of fact rather than discussions of historical trend. But instances are far too numerous in which the fact is not even fact. A few representative examples of such inaccuracy may be cited. The story of the founding of the College of William and Mary is thrice told (pages 10, 73, and 234), with each time a different date. Neshaminy, the seat of William Tennent's famous "Log College", is located in New Jersey (p. 64). Jonathan Boucher, the tutor of Washington's stepson, makes a statement which is quoted and assigned to the year 1678 (p. 65), and the context shows that the date is not merely a misprint. The account of the early course of study in public high-schools (p. 174) is misleading. Equally misleading are statements made on pages 78, 199, and 257 concerning Columbia College and the University of the State of New York. For instance, the Board of Regents, as constituted by the act of 1784, was legally much more than "an advisory board for Columbia College" (p. 199). Against the statement (p. 200) that the duties of the State Board of Education in California "are almost entirely confined to the examination and certification of teachers", should be set the fact that this board has nothing to do with the examination of teachers, and that an important part of its duties are those relating to the text-book system of the state.

To say (p. 218) that Lilly's *Latin Grammar* was first printed in London in 1755 is to overlook almost a quarter-millennium of Latin in the schools of old England. It is doubtless Ward's edition of that famous book that is referred to.

Inaccuracies abound in the accounts of the several colleges and universities, as when the General Court of Massachusetts is made to vote money for a college in 1630, Cotton Mather is made president of Harvard College, and that institution is declared to have been "nominally under state control" until 1865. Unwarranted liberties are taken with the text of historic documents, as in the surprising version (p. 25) of a vote of the town-meeting of Boston. There are numerous slips and incongruities in some of the lists of references, as, notably, in those following chapters iv and xv. The list of particular instances might be greatly extended.

One would gladly find something more favorable to say of a work on which so much of serious labor has been expended. Probably the best portions of the book are those, mainly in the latter half, in which the author sets forth and analyzes the information available with reference to the recent history and present state of our educational system in some of its special aspects—commercial education, learned societies, the education of the Indian, etc. But even in such portions we could sometimes wish for more convincing evidence that the items presented have been adequately sifted or that they have been interpreted with genuine insight.

ELMER ELLSWORTH BROWN.

*Napoleonic Studies.* By J. HOLLAND ROSE, Litt.D. (London: George Bell and Sons. 1904. Pp. xii, 398.)

THIS volume is a most important supplement to the author's *Life of Napoleon*. The twelve papers and ten appendixes which it contains have all or nearly all been published from time to time in one or another review. It was worth while to collect them. While they vary in their temper and treatment as widely as the subjects, yet the author's personality gives them quite sufficient unity to secure the interest of the reader and the continuity of the subject. In our opinion those on "The Idealist Revolt against Napoleon", on "Napoleon's Religious Belief", and on "The Whigs and the French War" are of literary interest but not in the author's best vein, which is rather the reasoned treatment of the state papers he has so industriously collected. Each of the three essays entitled respectively "Pitt's Plans for the Settlement of Europe", "Napoleon and British Commerce", and "Austria and the Downfall of Napoleon" is admirable in its way, the last being the most novel and interesting of the three. Numbers iv, "Egypt during the First British Occupation", v, "Canning and Denmark in 1807", vi, "A British Agent at Tilsit", viii, "Britain's Food Supply in the Napoleonic War", xi, "The Prussian Co-operation at Waterloo", and xii, "The

Detention of Napoleon by Great Britain", all belong to the field of British apologetics in history. They are convincing discussions of questions which affect the course of history to be sure, but which after all have not determined the channel of its great central stream.

Incidentally they clear up several little mysteries of antiquarian interest. The reader will be amazed at the slight knowledge of Egypt which the western world possessed a hundred years ago! It appears that Canning's information about the treaty of Tilsit, though strangely roundabout, was secured through Russian channels and was strictly correct. It is interesting, most interesting, to read Mr. Rose's partial apology for Denmark. With masterly hand he destroys the legend that Britain's food supply throughout the Napoleonic wars was secured in spite of hostile efforts and by means of overwhelming naval superiority. In the matter of the never-ending Waterloo controversy, strict justice is measured to Prussia's participation, to both her mediate and her immediate influence on the culmination of the struggle. It is a novel point of view which is indicated, or at least hinted, that Wellington's force was really only the auxiliary in a campaign dependent for success upon the main army of Blücher. Two illusions, says Dr. Rose, have been dispelled: the British legend that the Prussians came in at the finish to reap Wellington's harvest; the French legend that seventy thousand Frenchmen held at bay as many foes under Wellington and as many more plus ten thousand under Blücher until treason turned the day. He feels that still a third should be relegated to oblivion: that Blücher's army, in the lately spoken words of Emperor William II, "rescued the English army from destruction at Waterloo".

Chapter XII, entitled "The Detention of Napoleon by Great Britain", gives a curious insight into the official mind of London for the years 1815-1821. The author's examination of the British archives has brought to light papers which seem to confirm others from French sources long since published in regard to plans for Napoleon's escape from St. Helena. There has never been any reasonable doubt that exile prolonged the emperor's life, because Prussia certainly, and probably Austria, would have executed him as a criminal had he fallen into their hands. That any careful or even respectable plans were ever made to rescue him from captivity remains thus far among the things not proved. Our author's contribution to the question creates some probability of their existence and exhibits clearly how uneasy and credulous the British officials were. This is the sufficient justification of many rigors which they practised. Lord Rosebery's volume on the St. Helena phase was a political pamphlet in the main and was so understood by most of his readers; in no sense a serious historical contribution, it somewhat disturbed many English minds, and possibly it was worth while to refute his positions, as is done thoroughly in this chapter. Napoleon did escape from Elba, and cost Europe millions of treasure as well as countless lives. It was not intended that he should escape from St. Helena, and he did not. He was shabbily treated as an emperor, perhaps; but the gov-



ernment house was not available for his lodging, because, as we here read, it was the center of all the signal system from every point of the island, and after that he had the best there was. A new and more commodious house than Longwood was prepared and erected, but he desired the rôle of martyr and would never, except under compulsion, have occupied a first-rate dwelling. As General Bonaparte, a state prisoner, the captive was treated with considerable generosity. Of this the household accounts afford quite sufficient evidence.

The most important of all these papers is the second. Hitherto our knowledge of both French and British policy between the years 1795 and 1805 has been based almost exclusively on continental sources. An enlightened and singularly scientific policy has ordered the French archives so thoroughly and opened them to the public so generously that almost of necessity historians have been influenced by this fact. Both the British and the Austrian governments have so arranged the management of their historical fountains that only persistent residents of the respective lands could secure access to the penetralia. Dr. Rose himself has had almost a monopoly of the Public Record Office during the Napoleonic era, though others would fain have enjoyed the same privilege. Accordingly he is able to trace step by step in an interesting and convincing way the evolution of British policy as Pitt framed it. He shows how in 1795 the hopes of Britain were founded in Austria, how Bonaparte's Italian campaigns shattered those plans and in 1798 threw England and Russia temporarily together for the pacification of Europe. It was then for the first time that Pitt, knowing how eager the Hapsburgs were to let Belgium go in return for some gain nearer home, first suggested the idea of a Dutch-Flemish state as a barrier to French ambitions for the "natural" boundaries. More important still is the exhibition of such inherent weakness in the Second Coalition as to disprove conclusively that France owed her territorial integrity and her very existence to the frenzied exertions of the Convention. It is also shown that the initiative for the Third Coalition came from Russia. Further, we get a clear view of Pitt's mind. Utterly destitute of any liberal sentiment about the right of peoples to self-determination—the very word was unknown in 1805 to European statesmen—he firmly believed in the nationality of states which had exhibited nationality. In support of the balance of power he was willing to spend five million pounds in European subsidies; this and similar details were carried out in 1814 when Canning negotiated "his" treaty of Chaumont. Pitt desired the independence of Switzerland and Holland, the autonomy of both Italy and Germany. Our author admits that Pitt's policy looked to existing needs only, and that it was premature; he makes clear, however, that after the furnace heats and cyclopean weldings of the Napoleonic wars it reasserted itself and has proved more practical than the schemes of the French emperor.

We cannot reprint even the substance where there is so much that is vital to a reconstructed and scientific view of modern history, and we



have given only a sample. Likewise in regard to the other most important chapter, that numbered x and relating to Austria's participation in Napoleon's downfall, we can give only an instance or two. Here Dr. Rose works at second-hand, relying on the biographies of Austrian diplomatists in part, and in part on the state papers printed by Austrian historians from their own archives, apparently as accessible to natives and not more open to strangers than those of London. Two facts are emphasized: that twenty years of military failure had left Austria impoverished; that in 1813 she had really far more to fear from the czar than from the emperor Napoleon. It seems proved that Metternich really desired peace, and that his offer of friendly intervention in April was sincere. Napoleon rejected it for both military and dynastic reasons. Then for the first time, about July, Austria for self-preservation framed her policy of armed mediation. The declaration by the emperor Francis of war on his son-in-law, the methods by which he used his own child to secure state secrets, the subsequent behavior of Maria Louisa, these in connection with numerous unedifying details have combined to place Francis in a very dark light at the bar of history. If the Austrian emperor actually sacrificed natural affection and inclination to the interests of his people as is indicated above, the judgment of posterity will eventually be modified if not reversed. Finally we call attention to the confirmations that Dr. Rose's gleanings afford of the fact that the armistice which Napoleon granted at Poischwitz while the allies consulted was the verge of his undoing. Had he driven his foe onward to Glatz, as was well within his power, and so have forced a conclusive struggle there, the event would have favored him almost beyond a peradventure. To reject the moderate terms formulated by the Congress of Prague was possibly a grave fault; probably, however, it would have been a more serious one to accept a sovereignty limited by European consent. Had he made the first step backward in 1813 after the awful diminution of prestige due to 1812, there might have been delay in the Napoleonic decline, but the chances are that nothing short of an impregnable military power could ever have supported his authority. The decline of that military power dates from the fateful armistice. A movement carefully studied and based on sound considerations, both diplomatic and military, proved futile only and solely through an error of military judgment. This error was due to his fatal conviction that Austria, facing an ultimatum, would again yield to his iron will as she had so often done before.

*The Napoleonic Empire in Southern Italy and the Rise of the Secret Societies.* By R. M. JOHNSTON. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1904. Two vols., pp. xxi, 408; ix, 232.)

To recount the events and conditions of the Two Sicilies is the most disheartening labor which to-day confronts the serious student of nine-

teenth-century Italian history. Published sources are not wanting, but those that are trustworthy are few, while critical research has here most of its work yet to perform. Public and private archives are rich in documents, but they have been little studied, and their publication remains in most part a work for the future. Deficiency of enthusiasm for Italian unity, and a mercurial discontent with government, may account in part for the failure of students in southern Italy to exploit the sources of their recent history. Perhaps the want of a high-class and enterprising Neapolitan publisher has contributed to the same result; certainly De Cesare and Ravaschieri, the most recent Neapolitan historians of note, have found their publishers outside the boundaries of the ancient kingdom.

The Napoleonic empire, the restoration, and the revolution of 1820 are as deficient in published material as the later Neapolitan periods of the century, and the writing of the present volumes, intended for the serious general reader, demanded courage, as well as historical enterprise. Sicily has been excluded from the narrative in order to give it greater unity, and because despatches of Lord Bentinck remain shut up in British secret archives. However, Sicilian relations have been outlined when necessary, and the account does not lose by the exclusion. Mr. Johnston frankly admits the limitations of his work in the face of inadequate sources, but believes that his account is in "the broad outline substantially true". He has certainly done a useful piece of work; the English reader no longer need depend on the English translation of Colletta, a primary source, but very untrustworthy, an apology and a series of libels rather than a history. Mr. Johnston's narrative is entertaining, and exhibits breadth of view and considerable discernment. Unfortunately, evidence of haste and carelessness in preparation is not wanting. Some of his sketches are well done, and he has put in relief facts often neglected. The importance of Naples in the Napoleonic plan he emphasizes effectively, perhaps in some disproportion, but he justly remarks that it has been passed over too lightly in histories of wider scope. It is not a slight merit that he keeps the larger European situation well in view. His conception of the real significance of the secret societies and of their mission is notably just and well stated. On the other hand, many of his appreciations of individual characters are open to criticism. Thus it is difficult to admit that Zurlo is worthy of "the foremost place among the patriots and statesmen of southern Italy" (II, 121). A tendency to undervalue Italian historians is noticeable, as is an excessive veneration for the learned but partizan Austrian historian of modern Italy, Helfert, who is complimented as being in a class by himself (II, 204). Many statements that are made are striking and suggestive, although they are sometimes contradictory or loosely expressed and do not bear the stamp of deliberate and exhaustive criticism. Jablonowsky, the Austrian minister at Naples, is described as too profound a diplomat to commit himself by advising the Neapolitan government on the deliberated fate of Murat in October, 1815 (I, 403-

404). He therefore found a diplomatic excuse for absenting himself from Naples. Further on, however, is it stated that Jablonowsky, "far below the average of Austrian diplomatic ability . . . had been officially reproved for not having assumed a purely neutral position in the question of the fate of Murat" (II, 54).

It is unfortunate that authorities for specific statements are not more frequently cited in foot-notes. On many facts and opinions, given by Mr. Johnston with all assurance, the best evidence is conflicting. The reader's confidence would have been increased had such conflict of authorities always been noted, and had the writer's position been substantiated. Perhaps more of such references were made in Mr. Johnston's original manuscript, of which, he tells us in his preface, four-fifths was irrevocably lost while out of his hands, and had to be rewritten without opportunity to consult many of his sources. From this misfortune the work has certainly suffered materially. In the original version, we are informed, there were "passages, extracts, and notes that were taken directly from the original material", found in researches among manuscript sources, particularly in the national library and state archives of Naples, and in the British War Office and the British Admiralty. Such quotations would have added greatly to the force of the work, and would perhaps have saved some errors. However, the loss of his original manuscript cannot excuse Mr. Johnston in the occasional foot-notes and in his bibliography for quoting falsely the statements of his accessible printed authorities. For example, he says (II, 217), "The theory of the conspiracy against Murat supported by Zahn, Sassenay, and Lemmi has been effectively answered by Dufourcq and Lumbroso." But the fact is that Lemmi disbelieves in the plot, and the scope of his study is to disprove it, while Lumbroso, instead of effectively answering arguments in favor of the plot, admits the possibility of its existence. Before condemning Lemmi's study (II, 207) as "unimportant", proving nothing, and adding "nothing to the subject", Mr. Johnston might have examined it with sufficient care at least to form a correct idea of the writer's general position, which is declared in neither uncertain nor ambiguous terms. Again, a more intimate knowledge of Italian historical literature would have made it impossible for Mr. Johnston to designate the eminent Piedmontese jurist, Federico Sclopis, as a Bourbonist.

The bibliography of nearly five hundred titles, which is appended, abounds in errors, and in faults of bibliographical usage. Galvani's *Mémoires*, and *Nouveaux Mémoires*, cited as separate works (II, 202), should have been given as two editions of one work, printed in fact from one set of plates. Corridore's pamphlet was not "written on a newly found proclamation" but on one published over seventy years before by Franceschetti. It is bad bibliographical usage to omit altogether a pseudonym because the author's true name has been discovered, as in the case of Justus Tommasini, pseudonym of J. H. C. Westphal. The notes of the bibliography are descriptive as well as critical; the descrip-

tive part might well have been extended. Taken as a whole, the bibliography is comparatively full, and as a list of titles it is a useful contribution to bibliographical studies of the period. It is unfortunate that all the important sources cited were not laid under contribution in the preparation of the narrative.

H. NELSON GAY.

*A History of the British Empire in the Nineteenth Century.* By MARCUS R. P. DORMAN, M.A. Volume II. *The Campaigns of Wellington and the Policy of Castlereagh (1806-1825).* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Company; Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1904. Pp. xiv, 374.)

MR. DORMAN'S *History of the British Empire*, of which the second volume is now before us, has already won for itself a place of merit in historical literature. It aims to present a consecutive account of British foreign and domestic policy, claiming originality only so far as foreign relations are concerned. In the latter respect it is a contribution of substantial value, even in the presence of the writings of Fyffe and Rose, each of whom had access to the Foreign Office papers. Mr. Dorman has used the same documents with greater skill than did Fyffe in his *Modern Europe* and with greater fullness than did Rose in his *Life of Napoleon I.* For the period to 1825, which marks the close of Mr. Dorman's second volume, he has been able to interweave foreign and domestic policies in a more elaborate discussion than Stern was able to do in his *Geschichte Europas, 1815-1871*, and so to give a treatment of the period that is clearer and fresher than that of the German writer. The attitude assumed throughout is that of a fair-minded and impartial narrator.

Mr. Dorman pays little attention to affairs in France and central Europe. His point of view is always British and his desire is to elucidate the part played by British statesmen and soldiers in continental affairs. He is not writing a history of Europe in the nineteenth century. His work is, therefore, somewhat disproportionate and his handling of other subjects than his own largely conventional. Where he needs to fill in his picture, as he frequently does in the earlier portion, he draws on Rose and Napier for information, strangely enough neglecting entirely Oman's recent work, and occasionally, as in his discussion of the policy of Fox in 1806, he adopts not only Rose's sequence of ideas but even some of his words and phrases. Such a mild form of plagiarism seems unnecessary, since Mr. Dorman does not display in other portions of his history either slipshod scholarship or poverty of thought. He not only elaborates and improves existing accounts, but he introduces a considerable body of new information drawn from the correspondence of British representatives in other countries. He throws light on the Welcheren expedition (pp. 64-65); on the part played by General Chitroff in betraying information to the British government

(p. 93); on the negotiations between Alexander and Napoleon in 1811 (p. 104); and on the position of Prussia in February, 1812, regarding which neither Rose nor Seeley was sufficiently well informed (p. 121). It may be that Mr. Dorman has placed almost too implicit a trust in the accounts of the British ministers and that his work would be more scholarly if he had made a more critical comparison of the British and foreign reports. It is rather a striking fact that with the exception of Napoleon's *Correspondance*, Wellington's *Despatches*, Castlereagh's *Correspondence*, and the debates in Parliament, Mr. Dorman has made no use of other original material than the records in the British Foreign Office. He knows nothing of foreign archives or of foreign authorities. For this reason, his work, clear and readable as it is, has a certain appearance of insularity and incompleteness.

The second portion of the history, dealing with the period from 1815 to 1825, is chiefly concerned with the policy of Castlereagh. Mr. Dorman justly follows the present tendency to rehabilitate that statesman and to clear his name of the taint of reaction that has hitherto clung to it. He shows that Castlereagh did no more than uphold the best traditions of the British government. In the first place, Castlereagh consistently attempted to enforce treaties to the letter, and in so doing, particularly in the case of the alliance of November, 1815, was charged by the opposition in England at the time, and has been charged by many writers since that time, with joining a conspiracy to check the liberties of Europe. It is certainly true that Castlereagh had little faith in the power of the people to govern themselves wisely and peacefully, but many other men of that day, with the experiences of the French Revolution fresh in their minds, thought the same and deemed it no fit time for men in office to make experiments with popular government. Castlereagh did believe in constitutional government and therein differed wholly from Metternich, with whom he has been classed by careless writers. Probably his close identification with Metternich and the Metternichian policy has been due in part at least to his faith in the necessity of maintaining the continental alliances in order to keep the peace abroad and to assure moderation in the foreign and domestic policy of the continental governments. He labored hard to calm strong passions everywhere, and his loyal support of the duke of Richelieu in France was due to his hatred of the White Terror. Yet he opposed Alexander's project for a periodical meeting of the powers, since neither he nor the British government believed that treaties should be upheld by any such means.

In the second place, he refused to interfere with the domestic affairs of another nation, and he considered that every people should be free to conduct its own government as it liked, as long as it did not endanger thereby the peace of Europe. For this reason he refused to force the Bourbons on France in February, 1815; to coerce the king of the Netherlands when the freedom of the press seemed to be abused in that country; to interfere in Italy, at the time of the Neapolitan uprising; or

to prevent Austria from doing what she liked at Laibach, a refusal that drew down upon him the malediction of the liberals and won for him the approval of Metternich. On the question of the South American republics he made it clear, despite the endeavors of Spain and Portugal, that the British government would not agree to force the insurgent colonies to submit and that any coercion on the part of Spain would not be permitted. Canning in reality did little more, for it is evident from Castlereagh's statements that he fully expected the eventual independence of the colonies.

In passing judgment upon the statesmen of that time historical writers have drawn too sharp a line between Castlereagh and Canning on one side, and have failed to show the vital differences that existed between Castlereagh and Metternich and Wellington on the other. In fact, there are more points in common between Castlereagh and Canning than between Castlereagh and Wellington. Both were in favor of that "hardy annual", the Roman Catholic claims; both opposed parliamentary reforms but believed in constitutional government; and both upheld the cause of the South American republics. As a recent writer well puts it: "The difference between them was not one of principles but of character. Castlereagh was a bad speaker, but a man of sound judgment, cool and courageous, who combined suavity with strength. Canning was a man of fine and brilliant genius who looked at affairs 'with the excitable disposition of the poet and the orator', and he had the orator's craving for popular applause." I am inclined to think that Mr. Dorman has not made some of his points with as much force and courage as would have been done by a writer with a firmer grasp of his subject and greater power as an analyzer of character; nevertheless, he has done a good work in upholding the right and in maintaining what he believes to be true. We shall look with interest for the appearance of further instalments of his history.

A few errors may be noted: the statement that Charles IV of Spain was "promised half the Portuguese colonies in return for Etruria" is not true (p. 33); Asturias led the revolt in 1808, not Galicia (p. 37); Beylen should be Baylen (p. 38); Kustrim should be Küstrin (p. 42); Robert Smith was Secretary of State in the United States in 1809, not "the confidential Minister of the President" (p. 86); the reference to Rose on page 185, note 2, should be to volume II, not volume XI; and on page 289, the memorandum drawn up for the use of Wellington at Verona after Castlereagh's death was drafted originally by Castlereagh himself for his own use and not by Canning as Mr. Dorman implies, since Canning wrote only that portion relating to the eastern question. The spellings Plesswig, Vitoria, and Plate are to say the least unusual, and Gourgand (p. 203) is certainly wrong. The colloquial form "Peninsular" used as a noun throughout this work is decidedly objectional.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.



*History of Andrew Jackson: Pioneer, Patriot, Soldier, Politician, President.* By AUGUSTUS C. BUELL. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1904. Two vols., pp. viii, 432; vi, 427.)

*Life and Times of Andrew Jackson: Soldier, Statesman, President.* By A. S. COLYAR. (Nashville: Marshall and Bruce. 1904. Two vols., pp. xvii, 419; xii, 425-855.)

It is something of a coincidence that two gentlemen who have nurtured as lifetime passions the purpose of writing a life of Jackson should have brought their plans to fruition in the same year. Both have been inspired with the same motive. Both have thought that the large and much-used Parton was lacking in sympathy for the great Tennessean. Both have written glowing, partial, and uncritical accounts of Jackson's career. Mr. Colyar is a lawyer; Buell was a newspaper man. Each has his own distinctive style. The former masses his arguments with an eye to securing the judgment of the average citizen on the jury; the latter writes with the alertness and human interest of the correspondent who works up an interesting incident for the Sunday edition. Neither is a historian. Neither knows deeply the history of the period in which Jackson lived, or estimates properly the forces which at the time bore our national life onward.

Let us see their own words: "I found", says Mr. Colyar (p. 6), referring to his first investigations in the subject, "that two lives had been written—one a book of more than 2,000 pages, written evidently by a man to make money, without any just appreciation of a biography which was to form a part of American history; the other was written by a New England professor, and by a man who evidently, as he shows in his book from the very start, was not a friend of the War of 1812, and that he could not do justice to a general who had been an important factor in that war." For this New England professor the author has a pet dislike, and he comes back to him in the following words: "A Mr. William Graham Sumner, Professor of Practical and Social Science in Yale College, has tried his hand in what is known as 'The American Statesman Series'. . . . This Hartford Convention apologist is put forward by some concerted action to write for the 'American Statesman Series,' which goes into all the libraries, the life of democracy's greatest hero. Surely democracy is unfortunate in the selection of men to take care of the fame of its great idols" (I, 34-35). Mr. Buell did not live to write a preface for his work; but in the preface which the publishers have inserted he is quoted as follows (p. vi): "It is difficult to find a book on American history from the Revolution to this day which does not have something to say about General Jackson. As a rule, the more American a book is in spirit and feeling the more it will say about him and the more favorable its tone of comment will be." These sentences proclaim the purposes of their writers. They have both written "democratic" biographies. Of the two Buell's



is least biased, but neither attains the standard of fair and restrained historical judgment.

After saying this much, one may dismiss Mr. Colyar by mentioning two statements which illustrate his method. He asserts that the news of the American success in the campaign against the Creeks induced the British commissioners to sign the treaty of Ghent, thus "showing that General Jackson made the treaty of Ghent just as much as he fought the battle of New Orleans" (I, 10). Of the fact that the Creek campaign closed eight months before the treaty was signed he makes no mention. Again, one finds the assertion that Jackson was "the finest letter writer (take his letters in all their aspects) that this country has produced" (I, 12-13). This opinion is formed by the author after reading more than a hundred of his hero's letters. If one will examine the vastly larger collection of Jackson letters in the possession of the Library of Congress, he will perhaps come to a different conclusion. This collection, it must be added, has not been examined by Mr. Colyar. That Jackson was a forcible letter-writer no one will doubt; but his style as shown in the drafts and in those letters which did not get the polishing of another hand than his was plain, direct, and commonplace. Frequently his letters had many errors of grammar and spelling. He was, perhaps, of all our Presidents the least acquainted with, and the least fond of, good literature.

Against Mr. Buell's style of expression one cannot bring the charge of dullness. He has written with alertness and clearness. He has given us a personal biography in which an abundance of incident and many amusing anecdotes are introduced. He has a journalist's eye for color. He knows the value of a good story. He has not examined the Jackson manuscripts, but has relied, as he confesses, chiefly on "personal interviews with many eminent men and women" who were associated with Jackson. Among these are F. P. Blair, Sr., from whom he got extensive recollections, the widow of President Polk, and William Allen of Ohio, who came into public life while Jackson was President. All of these were interviewed by the author when they were very old. No student of history needs to be told that evidence like this should be treated with great discrimination. In addition to this we are assured that the biographer has consulted "books and pamphlets and public records almost innumerable"; but the absence of foot-notes gives us no opportunity to see what particular works have been used. Of two very important recent printed sources no use has evidently been made, namely, Professor Jameson's edition of the Calhoun correspondence and Professor R. C. H. Catterall's history of *The Second Bank of the United States*; and from the lack of these authorities his *History of Jackson* goes sadly awry.

Mr. Buell accepts the old story of Clay's influence in bringing on in 1832 the fight for the recharter of the bank. Professor Catterall, however, has shown by ample reference to Biddle's correspondence (*The Second Bank of the United States*, 215-223) that this conflict came

about through the entire knowledge and volition of the president of the bank, and that the matter was not primarily a party measure. It was undertaken after deliberate consideration by the bank officials because they thought that, all conditions considered, it was most likely to lead to a new charter. Moreover, it was not decided upon till early in January, 1832, which was a fortnight after the Baltimore convention had adjourned and a month after Congress had met.

Mr. Buell's facile narrative is full of errors great and small. For example, it is not true that Van Buren was responsible for the recall of Harrison from Bogota (II, 220). Harrison was recalled on March 10, 1829, and Van Buren did not become secretary of state until the last of the same month. It is not apparent that Mrs. Donelson, the mistress of the White House, "yielded to the influence of the Calhoun, Branch, Berrien and Ingham women" (II, 232). Her husband was not favorable to Eaton, and this may have had some influence over her views; but there is nothing to show that in regard to Mrs. Eaton she did not act on her own initiative. In view of the general opinion in Washington on the subject, there was certainly ground enough for her to take a stand without the influence of the cabinet ladies. Neither is it true that Mrs. Donelson returned to the White House after an absence of six months (II, 249). She left in the winter of 1829-1830 and did not return till September, 1831. It is not true, if one may credit the voluminous correspondence on the subject which one finds in Niles, that Ingham in the affair with Eaton used alleys and backyards in getting to his own house (II, 252). There are in the book serious omissions of facts. What shall we say to a narrative of this kind which dismisses the breach of Calhoun and Jackson in 1831 in eleven lines (II, 240); which gives to the break-up of the cabinet in the same year only sixteen lines (II, 251); and which gives only four lines to the Maysville road bill and nine to Jackson's relations with W. J. Duane? The reluctance with which Jackson broke with the South-Carolinians in regard to nullification receives little consideration (II, 238-240). Benton did not move to Tennessee with his aged mother in 1794. He was then only twelve years old. He left North Carolina in 1799.

JOHN SPENCER BASSETT.

*Historic Highways of America.* By ARCHER BUTLER HULBERT. Vols. XIII and XIV. *The Great American Canals.* (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company. 1904. Pp. 231, 234.)

THE first volume of this subseries treats of the Potomac Company's canal, the Chesapeake and Ohio, and the Pennsylvania canals. The omission of the many other canals constructed within the United States indicates the author's intention to select from the artificial waterways those which he considers historic instead of making an exhaustive treatment of ways of travel.

Prefacing his story proper with a sketch of the efforts of Robert Morris and other early promoters of improved internal navigation, Mr. Hulbert presents in detail the puny attempts of the "Potowmack Company" to harness the length of the great river as far as Fort Cumberland to the uses of navigation. By dredging channels and by constructing canals about the Great Falls it was hoped to use this rapid stream as if it had been another slow-moving Hudson. Experience soon taught that between low water in one season and ice and high water in another, few opportunities were left for the propulsion of craft. A legislative committee thought forty-five days of the year about all that could be depended upon. Notwithstanding the will power and the influence of General Washington given to its inception, the scheme proved a failure, and after thirty-six years of experiment and the expenditure of nearly \$800,000, the project was abandoned; or, rather, it was replaced by an artificial channel parallel to the river throughout its navigable length instead of employing the river proper. Searchers for historic remains who cross the Potomac at the Great Falls a few miles above the city of Washington will find the shallow excavation of the old canal and the foundations of the small locks by which the company hoped to circumnavigate the falls. At the lower falls may still be found iron rings set into the rocks, by means of which boats were to be warped over the rapids.

The history of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Company, the successor of the "Potowmack Company", affords opportunity to contrast the commercial hopes which centered about the city of Washington with those indulged in by the people of Baltimore. The one port was the eastern terminus of the proposed canal; the other became the end of the Baltimore and Ohio railway, designed to offset the canal as an outlet for western trade. The long and bitter contest between the two companies and, incidentally, between the rival kinds of transportation is well brought out by Mr. Hulbert. His description of the embryonic railway and the crude attempts to master steam transportation is easily one of the most interesting parts of the series. The 185 miles of the canal, extending from Washington to Cumberland, Maryland, was completed in 1851 at a cost of \$11,071,176.21 and is still operated by the trustees under a mortgage. As Washington was fed by this canal and Baltimore by the railroad, so Philadelphia attempted to get her share of western trade by the Pennsylvania state canal.

The Pennsylvania Canal, which connected Philadelphia with Pittsburgh, was completed in less than ten years after work was begun. It included two portage railroads, the one between the Schuylkill and the Susquehanna and the other the famous "Portage Railroad" across the Allegheny mountains from Johnstown to Hollidaysburg. This was the greatest engineering feat of the day. It was accomplished by ten "planes" up which cars were drawn by steam power. The total length of nearly 400 miles of canal and railways between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh was built at a cost of ten million dollars, half a million more than the Erie canal.

An entire volume devoted to the Erie canal will probably be considered the most adequate treatment of the series. It embraces the various projects for improving the Mohawk, the dreams of the early promoters of an internal waterway between the Atlantic and the Lakes, the memorial written by De Witt Clinton and presented to the legislature of New York in 1816, the details of the canal construction, its local influences, and the later agitation for an enlarged waterway. Readers will miss the local color which lent a charm to the earlier numbers of this series. The chapter on local influences of the canal comes nearest to this need and is a bit of work really worth doing. It seems to be taken almost entirely from *The Influence of the Erie Canal upon the Population along its Course*, a monograph by Julius Winden in the University of Wisconsin series.

The various agitations for a half-century looking to the enlargement of the Erie canal to a ship-canal are fully described in the concluding chapter. The author thinks its possibilities would place New York in the lead in promoting water transportation in the inland region as she was when the canal was first built. However, it would come from the canalization of rivers rather than from building artificial waterways.

EDWIN E. SPARKS.

*The South American Republics.* By THOMAS C. DAWSON, American Minister to Santo Domingo. Volume II. Peru, Chile, Bolivia, Ecuador, Venezuela, Colombia, Panama. [The Story of the Nations.] (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1904. Pp. xiv, 513.)

*A History of South America, 1854-1904.* By CHARLES EDMOND AKERS. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company; London: John Murray. 1904. Pp. xxviii, 696.)

WHEN Mr. Dawson's first volume appeared it had the field to itself, but with the second there comes a competitor. Yet Mr. Akers's new book is practically a history of his own times, while Mr. Dawson has given us a two-volume collection of historical primers, each primer dealing with a South American republic and being complete in itself.

This method of treating the subject was fairly successful in the first volume, for Brazil, Argentina, Paraguay, and Uruguay have had but little common history. In the second, on the other hand, it has involved repetition and confusion, for the countries here treated have often been the scenes of different acts in the same drama. This is especially true of the period of the wars of independence. Two great generals, Bolivar in the north and San Martin in the south, gradually forced the Spaniards to make a final stand in Peru, where they were eventually defeated by the combined armies of north and south. The material for writing a reliable popular account of this great struggle is more accessible than that for any other period, and yet the method of treatment has so chopped up and distributed the campaigns as to make

the most reliable part of the book the most confused. Bolivar's campaigns are quite inverted. First one reads of their ending (p. 96); two hundred pages later we have the middle (p. 318); while still farther on the beginnings are told twice (pp. 364 and 433).

Of recent events in the states east of the Andes Mr. Dawson was enabled in the first volume to speak very clearly and comprehensively by reason of his long residence in Brazil and his personal acquaintance with many of the leading men in those countries. But in the second his exposition of contemporary history is disappointing. There are too many names and dates and too few explanatory remarks. There is a tendency to dwell on the period of the conquest and to leave untouched the difficult business of untangling the innumerable revolutions of the past eighty years. For instance, of the part devoted to Peru, less than half is given to the story of the republic, yet most persons will prefer to read the story of the Incas and their fall in the charming pages of Prescott, especially as Mr. Dawson has nothing to add to the old traditions of "that magnificent civilization which the Spaniards destroyed".

It may be claimed indeed that the book does not pretend to make any addition to our knowledge of South American history, but even as a collection of historical primers its value is seriously impaired by evidences of hasty or inaccurate compilation. Take for instance the account of the Scots settlement on the isthmus of Darien (p. 429). "Twelve thousand Scotchmen" are made to land on "the unsettled Central American coast north from the Isthmus". "Two small supplementary expeditions arrived in 1699 to find assembled a Spanish fleet and army", and after the colony was definitely abandoned the coast was "placed under the jurisdiction of the captain-general of Cuba, and the claim that Colombia set up after she became an independent nation has never held good against the Central American republics." Now in the first place there were only twelve hundred Scots; secondly they landed on the coast southeast from the isthmus; thirdly the Spaniards did not arrive until six months after the first "supplementary expedition" and three months after the second; and finally this coast has always been considered as a part of Colombia until very recently. As there are no foot-notes, one is left to wonder whence came these remarkable statements.

To attempt to read the volume through is sufficiently confusing, but the publishers have not improved matters. The illustrations do not illustrate. A picture of "native costumes in Chile about 1840" (p. 179) faces the account of San Martin's campaign of 1818. A fine picture of the "railroad bridge between Santiago and Valparaiso" (p. 169) is used to illustrate the story of San Martin's crossing the Andes, which is described as a very difficult undertaking, and yet the text gives a false impression, if he had a railroad and bridges like the one depicted! Moreover the maps are inadequate and out of date.

Mr. Akers's publishers, on the other hand, have made the use of an atlas unnecessary. Indeed any one who possesses an atlas with

better maps of South America than this volume contains may consider himself fortunate. They are clear, complete, and thoroughly up-to-date. One cannot help smiling, however, to see emblazoned on the cover of this excellent volume the coat of arms of Mexico! As an earnest of what is to be expected of the illustrations it is misleading, for the latter are well chosen and well placed. They consist for the most part of portraits of historical celebrities and add greatly to the value of the book.

The scope of the volume appears from the title-page to be the fifty years from 1854 to 1904. As a matter of fact, with the exception of the Paraguayan War, 1865-1870, little space is given to anything preceding 1875. There are, to be sure, thirty-four pages of historical introduction, in which the uninformed reader will be dismayed at the array of names and dates and misled by the generalizations. Such statements as this, that the colonists in Spanish America came "from the scum" of the population of Spain and that they were "outcasts in their own country" (p. 6), need great modification. Again it is hardly true that "The beginning of the nineteenth century found the Spanish colonies seething with discontent against the rule of the mother country, and so ripe for revolt that a spark only was necessary to fire the train" (p. 19). Surely Miranda applied several sparks in 1806 without causing any explosion, and San Martin almost had to force revolt down the throats of the Peruvians as late as 1822. But these defects are more than compensated for by what follows.

Practically the book is an endeavor to give a vivid picture of the South America of the generation just closing, and for this task Mr. Akers is exceptionally well equipped. As South American correspondent of the *London Times* for fourteen years, he acquired an intimate knowledge of men and events besides an ability to tell clearly and comprehensively just what one wants to know. It is a pity that he has not told us of what campaigns and revolutions he was an eye-witness, for it is not difficult to realize that no one but an eye-witness could have described many of the operations as he has done. In fact the chief value of the book is that it can be used as a trustworthy contemporary history. It has the defects that the account of an eye-witness must have, even when he has been able to get the perspective of a few years and to hear the other side. But it has the advantage of being written by a writer trained to see clearly.

The most welcome feature of the book is the comprehensive treatment of important events. Yet scarcely less valuable are the comments on existing conditions. A few extracts of this character with regard to the administration of justice may prove enlightening. In Brazil "corruption is common in all branches of the judiciary, and the cost of litigation is abnormally high" (p. 313). In Argentina "in the minor branches opportunities for corrupt practices are widespread, and complaints are heard in all quarters of the ignorance and venality of magistrates and minor officials." Even the Supreme Court is not with-



out taint of bribery and corruption (p. 125). In Chile, "while the courts are unsatisfactory, the condition of the police is infinitely worse, and protection for life and property can hardly be said to exist in any outlying districts" (p. 418). "The administration of justice in Perú could not be more unsatisfactory than it is. . . . To obtain a favourable verdict bribery must be practised, and it is a question of who has the longest purse when a decision is reached. To this widely sweeping assertion there are no exceptions, the Supreme Court being no cleaner than the lower tribunals, it differs only in that payment must be on a higher scale" (p. 536). In Venezuela "corruption is deep-rooted in both higher and lower branches of the Judiciary" (p. 636).

One reason for this deplorable state of affairs is illiteracy. More than half of the population of Brazil are unable to read or write (p. 312). "The importance of this vital national question does not appeal to the majority of Brazilians" (p. 313). Even in Argentina there is "little public interest shown in educational questions" and this "is responsible for the absence of an effective system of instruction" (p. 124). In Chile the trouble seems to be that "constant wrangling in Congress has so engrossed the attention of the Chambers that no time has been available for the consideration of the true interests of the country" (p. 411). The death-rate in Valparaíso is 67 per thousand and in Santiago 72 (p. 411). Furthermore "to such a height has the abuse of alcohol now grown in Chile that official statistics show the consumption to be nearly four gallons of raw spirit annually per head of population." "Spirit distilled from rotten wheat, potatoes, maize, and the refuse from the wine-making establishments, is the poison eating into the life of the Chilean nation" (p. 413). Politically, the most striking fact in South America is the paramount influence which each president has in the choice of his successor. "Official influence is the main factor in all South American electoral contests", and the fact that a candidate can count upon the retiring president and his friends is ample assurance that he will be elected (p. 304). Nothing could better illustrate the difference between the South American republics and the United States, unless it be the venality of the courts.

On the whole Mr. Akers fully realizes the enormous economic possibilities as well as the stumbling-blocks in the way of substantial progress. Although hopeful for the future, he declares that "what is necessary to consolidate peace is the adequate administration of justice throughout these republics, protection for civil rights, and a more liberal system of public education" (pp. 649-650). Rarely does one find a book at once so useful to the specialist and so interesting to the tyro.

HIRAM BINGHAM.

*Recollections and Letters of General Robert E. Lee.* By Captain ROBERT E. LEE. (New York: Doubleday, Page, and Company. 1904. Pp. xiii, 461.)

THESE recollections and letters of General Lee, by his youngest son,



fill a distinct place among the many works of which this remarkable man has been the subject. They give us side-lights upon his career from his return from the Mexican War in 1848 to his death in 1870. The letters given are for the most part addressed to the members of his family, many of them to the son who now edits them. They all reveal, as nothing else could, the wealth of affection that he treasured up for wife and children, as well as the moral and religious elements of his character. It has often been remarked that no son should write the biography of his father—such a work being likely to degenerate into mere eulogy. Captain Lee, however, has not cared to intrude, to any great extent, his own impressions of his father's character. His contributions to this work take the form of explanations which render the letters intelligible, or of such recollections of his relations with his father in times of war and peace as every one will be glad to read. Moreover, the character of General Lee was so nearly perfect that there is no extraordinary danger of overpraise even from the partiality of a devoted son. Certainly such comments as Captain Lee has added are delightfully told and in perfect good taste. The style is simple, but betrays a practised hand. Where there are *lacunæ* in the letters, the writer quotes from Professor Trent's *Robert E. Lee* or from Colonel Taylor's *Four Years with General Lee*.

Of the letters themselves, a few contain details of family life which have no significance and might have been omitted; but the great majority fill in the outlines of General Lee's life in a most satisfactory fashion. Among the first given is the one, written February 25, 1868, in which Lee speaks of his resignation from the Federal army and denies the charge that he ever "intimated to any one" that he "desired the command" of that army (pp. 27-28). "Nor did I ever", he adds, "have a conversation with but one gentleman, Mr. Francis Preston Blair, on the subject, which was at his invitation, and, as I understood, at the instance of President Lincoln. After listening to his remarks, I declined the offer he made me, to take command of the army that was to be brought into the field; stating, as candidly and as courteously as I could, that, though opposed to secession and deprecating war, I could take no part in an invasion of the Southern States. I went directly from the interview with Mr. Blair to the office of General Scott; told him of the proposition that had been made to me, and my decision. Upon reflection after returning to my home, I concluded that I ought no longer to retain the commission I held in the United States Army, and on the second morning thereafter [April 20, 1861] I forwarded my resignation to General Scott. At the time, I hoped that peace would have been preserved. . . . Two days afterward, upon the invitation of the Governor of Virginia, I repaired to Richmond; found that the Convention then in session had passed the ordinance withdrawing the State from the Union; and accepted the commission of commander of its forces, which was tendered to me."

General Lee's war record is so well known that the most valuable

of these letters are those in which we catch glimpses of those deeper thoughts and feelings which he revealed to his family. His most marked characteristic is his religiousness—hardly less profound than that of Jackson himself. This is seen throughout the letters, but especially in those written in the trying times of war. "One of the miseries of war", he writes to his wife, "is that there is no Sabbath, and the current of work and strife has no cessation." In other letters is shown his intense belief in a special Providence. Speaking of his campaign in West Virginia, he writes: "I had taken every precaution to ensure success and counted on it; but the Ruler of the Universe willed otherwise, and sent a storm to disconcert a well-laid plan and to destroy my hopes."

When the war was over, Lee wished to seek a quiet home and to escape the hero-worship of the South; but he was soon called to the presidency of Washington College (now Washington and Lee University). Here he was to devote his remaining years to the education of Southern youth. Insurance companies and commercial enterprises wooed him in vain. "I am grateful", he wrote in answer to one proposal of this character, "but I have a self-imposed task which I must accomplish. I have led the young men of the South in battle; I have seen many of them die on the field; I shall devote my remaining energies to training young men to do their duty in life." During the period of Reconstruction no word of bitterness escaped his lips, though he felt deeply the degradation of his state. His advice to young men always contained a note of cheer. When one of his young cousins in 1870 was wondering what fate was in store for "us poor Virginians", Lee replied: "You can work for Virginia, to build her up again, to make her great again. You can teach your children to love and cherish her." His philosophy of life, moreover, was lightened by a canny humor, which he never lost even amid the hardships of war and which made him a favorite companion of children. These letters show that in play and conversation with children this great captain of the south found the deepest joy of his life.

The book is handsomely bound and printed, with fine portraits of Lee at different periods of his life. The last picture represents Valentine's wonderful recumbent statue. To the whole is added a good index of twenty pages.

JOHN R. FICKLEN.

*A History of the Colony of Victoria, from its Discovery to its Absorption into the Commonwealth of Australia.* By HENRY GYLES TURNER, F.I.B., F.R.G.S. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. Two vols., pp. xvi, 396; x, 389.)

In some respects Mr. Turner's history of the colony of Victoria recalls Kingsford's *History of Canada*, and in particular as regards the scale on which it has been written. Victoria to-day has a population

not much larger than that of the state of Connecticut. Its history goes back for little more than a century; yet such are the fullness and local and personal detail characterizing Mr. Turner's work that his volumes cover eight hundred closely printed pages. There is a lack of good histories of the Australasian colonies. Each colony has its own political, economic, religious, and social history; each colony has had to meet its own peculiar problems arising out of the circumstances under which it was first settled, or out of its connections with the mother-country; and a well-written and well-balanced history of any of the Australasian colonies should be of value. Mr. Turner's history, however, can scarcely be commended to non-Australasian students of Australasian history, or of British colonial enterprise; for it is so long as to tire the patience of any reader who is not deeply interested in the personal aspects of Australasian colonization, and in the ups and downs of Victorian ministers and the vicissitudes of colonial politicians in a colony in which political administrations have been invariably short-lived.

Mr. Turner intimates in his preface that he makes no pretensions to the science of history. It is well that he makes this avowal; otherwise he might be called to account for his bald and gratuitous statement that in 1787, when the first fleet left for Australia to found a permanent settlement at the antipodes, "George III was a recognized lunatic, but had not yet been superseded"; also for his inane remarks about the descendants of Penn in Philadelphia; for his misleading comparisons of Victorian achievement with the achievements of the Puritans in New England; and also for the loose and unscholarly way in which he refers to British ministries and to members of British cabinets who at one time or another held the office of secretary of state for the colonies, or its equivalent in the days preceding the creation of the Colonial Department. Mr. Turner's work is obviously that of an old settler—a labor of love on which many years have been spent. Regarded as such, his history of Victoria is well done, and far above the average of colonial histories written from this standpoint. It is written in a good, clear style, and generally carries the marks of much industry and care.

The history begins with the unsuccessful attempt to found a convict settlement at Port Philip, and carries the story of Victoria down to the end of the nineteenth century. Little that could be considered of importance in the political and economic history of the colony can have escaped Mr. Turner's vigilant attention and have gone unrecorded. Especial pains have been taken in narrating the political development of the colony—its separation from New South Wales and the various stages which marked its development from a crown colony to a colony with representative institutions and responsible government. The municipal history and the astonishing growth of Melbourne, the Chicago of Australasia, are also particularly well told. The same may be said of the chapters dealing with the discoveries of gold and with the political and social turmoil which the discovery of gold entailed; also of those

describing the various methods of parceling out government lands; and peculiar value also attaches to Mr. Turner's study of the causes of the panic and the financial disasters of 1890-1893, and to his sketch of the long-drawn-out agitation which finally led to the establishment of the Australian commonwealth.

Had Mr. Turner spent his long and busy life in England, he would apparently have been a Liberal of the school of Bright and Cobden. He has no sympathy with the protective policy of the colony of Victoria. He regards with grave distrust the system of payment of members of Parliament and other democratic innovations which have been made in the colony; and while he is unmistakably loyal to the British connection and writes with approval of the part which Victoria took at the time of the South African war, colonial militarism comes in for no commendation at his hands.

There is an admirable index. It extends to thirty-two pages; and surely there never was a book to which a good index was more necessary; for while few but specialists will be likely to read Mr. Turner's two volumes from beginning to end, they contain much that is of value and usefulness to more general students, and especially to students who are interested in the various new phases of democratic government as it has been developed in Victoria.

EDWARD PORRITT.

*A History of Military Government in Newly Acquired Territory of the United States.* By DAVID YANCEY THOMAS, Ph.D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, Volume XX, No: 2.] (New York: The Columbia University Press; The Macmillan Company; London: P. S. King and Son. 1904. Pp. 334.)

THE United States for over a century has been steadily adding to its possessions, and yet little attention has been given by investigators to the government that has been established in these new lands. Mr. Thomas is to be congratulated on being one of the first to cover this exceedingly interesting subject. Being a pioneer in the field of military government, for Birkhimer and Winthrop may be put aside as legal rather than historical writers, he has been forced to map out a new course.

The author divides his work into three parts. The first, comprising five chapters, gives the history of the annexations and governments of Louisiana and Florida. In both cases the history is carried down to the time when territorial government was established. Four-fifths of this part is devoted to the acquisition and government of East and West Florida. This is necessarily so, for there was little or no military government in Louisiana. The second part is devoted to New Mexico and California, with the greater attention given to the latter. The third division of the work, dealing with Alaska and our insular possessions,

is most unsatisfactory because of its insufficient treatment. One chapter of two short pages (pp. 279-280) is devoted to Alaska, and we are given but the barest outline of annexation together with a mere statement as to the extension of revenue laws and the time when territorial government was established. Some criticism might be offered on considering Alaska as a military government, but, if such a position is taken, more details of the government should certainly be given. Hawaii is discussed in a chapter of half a page (p. 281) with even less detail than that on Alaska. The third chapter treats of the Philippines, Porto Rico, Samoa, and the Panama Canal Zone. The greater portion of this chapter is devoted to the Philippines, but even here the treatment is very brief and not altogether satisfactory. The final chapter of nine pages, dealing with the constitutional questions arising in our new possessions, furnishes but a short summary. However, the conflicting cases on the subject are well shown, although there is a failure to quote from any of the leading decisions.

In the preface Mr. Thomas states his purpose to be the treatment of the legal status of new territory, the legal basis of military government, and an account of the actual management of new possessions from the time of their occupation until the organization of territorial government. In regard to Louisiana, Florida, New Mexico, and California, his plan involves a political as well as a military history of those parts during the period of transition. The author does not consider it necessary to treat Alaska and the insular possessions as fully as the earlier acquisitions. He uses them merely to demonstrate the development of military government since the Mexican War and to show how the constitutional questions were met. The character of the later governments is not touched, but is left, according to his own words, to the reader's memory of partizan accounts or to some later historian. From this statement it will be seen that the scope of the work is much larger than the title would indicate, involving a constitutional and political history. Frequently the author's interest seems to be more in the political than in the military side of the story. We shall try to see how far he fulfils the task which he sets himself.

Such a work as that of Mr. Thomas should give in its beginning a clear definition of military government, but no concise statement is found. In the introduction an attempt is made. He takes Chief-Justice Chase's definitions of military law, military government, and martial law delivered in the case of *ex parte* Milligan as a starting-point, but at the same time admits that the definitions of the last two are too vague for formulation; he then proceeds to cast aside military law altogether despite the fact that its regulations might be and were applied to non-military persons in conquered territory. In fact the first courts established by the conqueror often made use of this law. As regards martial law the author accepts the ruling of the Hague Tribunal, although that regulation is recent and does not apply necessarily to the century that has gone before. This is well illustrated in the treatment of New

Mexico (p. 113). There is failure also to give the general constitutional and legal basis of military government. Much more might be said upon the war powers of the Constitution and also upon the war powers of the President as discussed in *Martin vs. Mott* and in the Prize Cases. It is true that the writer makes good use of the cases that arise in reference to the particular territories under discussion, but he does not give the broad foundation of that government. He overlooks, also, acts that have been passed by Congress in regard to this matter; and certainly, regarding the military government of the later possessions, more attention or at least more reference could have well been made to the experience of the Civil War.

Individual statements often go without special reference. An example of this is found on page 26, where statistics are given and we are told that they are "from the latest documents obtainable". This absence of foot-notes is also shown on page 29 in speaking of the Catholic church of Louisiana and the powers exercised by its officers. The same fault is evident on pages 166, 238, and 263. The manner in which foot-notes are handled is open to serious criticism. At the end of the paragraph a single page reference will be used accompanied by "seq." This often covers a vast amount of reading and is unsatisfactory to one desiring to verify some special statement. An example of this is on page 29, where one paragraph treats of taxes, revenues, tariff, salaries, conveyances of real estate, fees, importation of money, and the deficit. The reference given is: "Ann., 8 Cong., 2 Sess., 1498 *et seq.* A few statements have been taken from Martin, Gayarré, and from Stoddard." No definite reference being given to the authors mentioned, one feels that a long research is necessary. The existence of a monograph of this kind is of doubtful utility, if references are not plentiful and exact.

Frequently the details of military government are overlooked or cast aside. Referring again to the case of the Catholic church in Louisiana (p. 29), the author speaks of the officers of the church as having judicial powers and yet he gives no idea of their jurisdiction. In the case of Arbuthnot and Ambrister he merely mentions their names in a foot-note and presents no details of the trial, which was by court martial in spite of the fact that the men were neutral foreigners. Again, in reference to the government of Amelia Island he fails to show the jurisdiction of the justices appointed by military authority and omits entirely the arbitration courts established there. The details of taxation are often overlooked; for example, in regard to New Mexico we are told that three pages of a military order were devoted to revenue but none of the details are given.

The best part of the author's work is that relating to Florida, New Mexico, and California. These acquisitions have been remarkably well treated and in general the judgment passed upon events is very fair and to the point. The taking possession of Florida, the attempt to form an independent state in West Florida, the seizure of Amelia Island, the manner in which Jackson overrode the local laws, the dispute over the



possession of the public records in the hands of the Spanish officials, the Callava and Fromentin incidents, receive most thorough treatment. Regarding New Mexico the comment on the scope of Kearny's action, especially upon his proclamation incorporating New Mexico into the United States, is very good. Mr. Thomas shows clearly the inconsistent position of the government established by Kearny under his so-called Fundamental Law. The uprisings against the United States and the treason trials growing out of them are given comprehensive treatment.

Turning to California, we reach the most satisfactory portion of the book. The Fremont incident is well treated, and the pettiness, not to say the dishonesty, of that officer is fully demonstrated. The conflicting orders of the War and Navy Departments in regard to California are brought out most clearly. The question of the Pueblos' lands was a most difficult one on account of the changing policy that the Mexican government had adopted in regard to them, but Mr. Thomas gives a good outline of the question. The court of admiralty with Alcalde Walter Colton at its head receives thorough discussion. He questions the action of levying forced contributions on the town of Santa Barbara, and inclines to take the later opinion on that subject, which is against such action. On the other hand he overlooks the fact that similar action was taken long after the Mexican War, and that it was frequently used in the south during and immediately after the War of the Rebellion. The awkward position in which the military commanders were placed in regard to the establishment of civil government is well described.

In conclusion it may be said that Mr. Thomas has given a comprehensive outline of the government of territory acquired by the United States before the Civil War. His work in that field will undoubtedly stand the test of time, and it is questionable if other writers can add much to the results obtained.

A. H. CARPENTER.

*Jerusalem under the High-Priests.* By Edwyn Bevan. (London, Edward Arnold, 1904, pp. ix, 170.) This work is a companion volume to the author's admirable *House of Seleucus*; the two books cover nearly the same period, but in the present volume the interest centers in Jewish history. The period between Nehemiah and the New Testament, almost unknown to the general reader, yields in importance to no other in Hebrew history; in it were composed the greatest books of the Old Testament and the whole of the Apocrypha, and in it were formulated the tendencies that have ever since dominated the Jewish people. Mr. Bevan's picture of the period, while popular in style, is thorough and accurate in matter. Into his attractive narrative of political events he weaves a sketch of the development of Jewish thought, including therein notices of the Book of Daniel and of all the great Apocryphal works of the time except the Wisdom of Solomon; it would have added to the interest of his description if he had included also the other canonical books (Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes). One of the



most noteworthy works of the period is Ben-Sira or Ecclesiasticus (about B. C. 190), a collection of ethical and other aphorisms and discourses, nearly allied to the canonical Proverbs, and much cited by the early Christian writers (it has a saying, XIII, 1, that may possibly throw light on Falstaff's reference, I Henry IV, II, 4, to "ancient writers" as authority for his observations on pitch); Mr. Bevan's account of the book is full and interesting. He properly devotes much space to the description of the great cultural event of the time—the invasion of Jewish society by Hellenism, including the attempt of Antiochus Epiphanes to Hellenize his realm. His analysis of this king's character differs a good deal from what has been the common opinion of him: Antiochus, he holds, was a statesman of no mean ability; his dream of unifying his world was noble and by no means absurd; if he wished to be worshiped as a god, this was nothing more than what the custom of the time conceded to kings; and, in fine, he was far from meriting the appellation "madman (Epimanes)" given him by his enemies. Other important points forcibly brought out by Mr. Bevan are: the character of Judas Maccabæus (whom he does not rate very highly), the results of the Hasmonean rule, the conflicts between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, and the policy and character of Herod. The volume is provided with an index and tables of the Hasmoneans and the Seleucids.

C. H. Toy.

The Reverend Samuel G. Green's *Handbook of Church History from the Apostolic Era to the Dawn of the Reformation* (New York and Chicago, Fleming H. Revell Company, 1904, pp. xii, 628) has some advantages for a student desiring a clear, well-defined outline of the subject with convenient chronological tables. The book can aid a learner in acquiring certain data, but will hardly furnish either a just view of persons who have fallen under ecclesiastical disfavor or a habit of search and construction which can be called scientific. The author is unnecessarily ready with suggestions of judgments, as, for example, in a comment on the fact that the persecuting emperors "rank in history among the best": "The reason is no doubt to be found partly in the false standards of excellence by which historians have judged."

F. A. C.

*A History of England for Schools, from Earliest Times to Death of Queen Victoria.* By Benjamin Terry, Ph.D., LL.D. (Chicago, Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1903, pp. xxvi, 622.) In point of scholarship, the merits and demerits of this volume are substantially the same as those of the author's previous *History of England* (1901), reviewed for this periodical in April, 1902 (VII, 543-545). Much of the same phraseology has been retained; but by a mingled process of omission, condensation, and careful rewriting, Professor Terry has succeeded in compressing his earlier and more advanced work into about

half its bulk, and thus producing for secondary schools a history both readable and useful.

Certain omissions were desirable to render the larger work available for secondary schools; others have been made at a minimum of loss. Among them are details concerning reigns and movements which were least influential in determining the final course of English history; descriptive passages which enhanced the vividness of the narrative but retarded its continuity and rapidity of action; military operations; and personal characterizations of unnecessary length. Continental conditions have been less fully described and the narrative made more purely English. The medieval period has been the most condensed.

The passages which deal with economic and literary subjects are practically repeated from the earlier work *totidem verbis*. Institutional history has also undergone comparatively few changes—a fact which makes the institutional element bulk even larger in the present book than in its predecessor. This is especially true of the medieval institutions, where the most important changes involve some simplification, a rearrangement of the chapter on feudalism, and the omission of certain technical details. The most serious defect is the absence of an adequate description of the way in which the House of Commons acquired its unique character and weight. The omission of an explicit statement of the Salic Law might also be challenged. In the realm of modern institutions changes are necessarily greater. Among the most important are the omission of the detailed account of papal legal claims on England, the explicit description of the Tudor administrative system, and certain details of the Act of Settlement.

In another edition the following points could be advantageously expanded: the relation of the battle of Bouvines to English constitutional developments; the danger to Elizabeth from assassination-plots; Burke's character and political importance; and, above all, an explicit statement of the Stuart theory of kingship. The volume contains some additional material in the way of special topics with bibliographies, and tables which illustrate the component parts of the modern cabinet and the modern Parliament, the judiciary system, and councils of local administration.

O. H. RICHARDSON.

*Mediæval Manchester and the Beginnings of Lancashire*, by James Tait, M.A. (Manchester, University Press, 1904, pp. x, 211), is a welcome addition to the literature of English local history, not merely because it adds much to our knowledge of the early history of Manchester and Lancashire, but also because it displays a scientific method of treatment which is rare in this field of study in England, where most local histories are written by industrious antiquaries rather than by trained historians. The first four chapters give a succinct survey of the history of Manchester from the eleventh to the fourteenth century. The third chapter is particularly valuable, for here the comparative

method is adopted in a careful study of the charter granted to Manchester in 1301 by Thomas Grelley; the various clauses of this document are compared with the corresponding clauses of the charters of Salford, Stockport, and other boroughs. The fifth chapter traces the gradual process by which the county of Lancaster, one of the latest English shires, came into existence by the amalgamation of various districts; and the last chapter, which investigates the status of the Lancashire baronies, calls attention to the interesting fact that barons who held of mesne lords and not directly of the crown were commoner in the twelfth century than is usually supposed. Professor Tait shows that the first mention of a county of Lancaster occurs in the Pipe Roll of 1168-1169, and that its full recognition as one of the English shires dates from about 1194. His view that the term "baron", in the century following the Norman Conquest, may have been applied to all the military tenants of the great feudatories, though presented with diffidence, is worthy of careful consideration. Perhaps a study of the early baronage of France might throw some light on the subject.

CHARLES GROSS.

The Colchester Town Council display commendable zeal in making the ancient muniments of their borough more accessible to the public. With the sanction of the council the *Red Paper Book* was published in 1902, and by their order a volume was printed in 1904 entitled *The Charters and Letters Patent granted to the Borough of Colchester by Richard I and Succeeding Sovereigns*, translated by W. Gurney Benham (Colchester, R. W. Cullingford, 1903, pp. xv, 219). We are also informed that "the Red Parchment Book and other archives of Colchester are in course of publication". Mr. Benham gives a translation of the twenty-six charters of the borough. Of these, perhaps the most interesting is the grant made to the burgesses by Richard I in 1189. It allows them to elect their own magistrates or bailiffs, to be quit of toll throughout England, and to clear themselves in pleas before the king's justices by the old process of compurgation instead of by judicial combat. It also limits the power of the king to fine or amerce the townsmen, and anticipates a well-known clause of John's Great Charter regarding the determination of amercements by the oaths of the burgesses. Moreover, it empowers them to elect justices to hold pleas of the crown, and it has been contended that in this passage we have the earliest reference to coroners. The last royal grant, dated February 20, 1818, gives an interesting conspectus of various typical burghal privileges and institutions, such as existed in England before the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835. Much space has been wasted by reproducing certain medieval charters which are recited in the confirmations of later kings. Thus the translation of the charter of Richard I is printed in this volume eight times, and there are several translations of the charters of Henry III, Edward III, and Richard II. The money expended in these useless repetitions would have been much

better invested in the publication of the Latin texts of the medieval charters.

CHARLES GROSS.

*Machiavelli and the Modern State.* By Louis Dyer, M.A. (Boston, Ginn and Company, 1904, pp. xix, 163.) None of the fundamental problems concerning the great Florentine's thinking is treated in these pages. What we have is a series of remarks, some of them on Machiavelli and none on the Modern State, grouped rather fortuitously about three topics: "The Prince and Cæsar Borgia", "Machiavelli's Use of History", "Machiavelli's Idea of Morals". Mr. Dyer's conclusions on these points seem to be: first, that Machiavelli's inability to judge character accounts for his admiration of the famous brigand; second, that he read his Roman history in the light of the contemporary history of the Swiss; and lastly, that he was willing to resort to atrocious and ignoble means for the redemption of Italy because he was misled by a metaphor—the comparison between a diseased body and a corrupt state.

If all these verdicts were true, they would still leave the question of Machiavelli's own interest in the state and the other question of his influence on the history of politics untouched. Thus, what Machiavelli chiefly admired about Cæsar Borgia was his success, and when that was at an end the Florentine's interest was at an end, also. (Cf. his letters from Rome, October and November, 1503.) Again, why did not the fatal metaphor of the state as an organism similarly mislead John of Salisbury and Nicholas Cusanus, who both employed it with all its pathological implications, with even greater system than Machiavelli. Of course Machiavelli's history is selective, and was so a decade before he became especially interested in the Swiss (see the pamphlet *Del Modo di trattare i Popoli della Val di Chiana Ribellati*, 1502). Why?

The "brilliant allusiveness" of the style, the great number of irrelevancies, and the florid overtranslations are, perhaps, more easily pardoned in three lectures than they would be otherwise.

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

*La Vita di Amerigo Vespucci a Firenze da Lettere Inedite a lui Dirette.* Per Ida Masetti-Bencini e Mary Howard Smith. [Estratto dal vol. XIII e dal vol. XIV della *Rivista delle Biblioteche e degli Archivi*.] (Florence, L. Franceschini e C., 1903, pp. 39.) This collection of seventy-one letters written to Vespucci by his family, friends, and business connections in the years 1483-1491 has been transcribed from the originals in the Medici Archives in Florence. The editors have prefixed a sketch which recounts what is known of Vespucci's early life and incorporates their deductions from these letters. Among their deductions is the conclusion that Vespucci was employed as a kind of steward of the Medici household and not in the banking firm. The letters re-

veal a Vespucci, the authors believe, "Who, if not a hero of the human race or a great genius, was on the other hand no mere adventurer, as some foreign historians, particularly Americans, will have him." Vespucci's name in the address most commonly appears as Amerigo although the spelling Amerigho is not infrequent. It is twice Latinized as Emericus. Almerigho is used once.

Although these letters do not add greatly to our knowledge of Vespucci's life, they may lead to a softened judgment as to his character. In other respects, they are chiefly interesting as illustrating Florentine business and domestic life.

E. G. BOURNE.

*The Epistles of Erasmus, from his Earliest Letters to his Fifty-first Year, arranged in order of time.* English translations with a commentary by Francis Morgan Nichols. Vol. II. (New York, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1904, pp. xiii, 638.) This second volume of Mr. Nichols's translation of the letters of Erasmus contains the correspondence of the years 1509 to 1517, that is, from the writer's return to England from Italy to the outbreak of the Protestant Reformation. It maintains the level of excellence set in the first volume, which appeared in 1901 and was noticed in this REVIEW (VII, 548-549). But excellence of translation is not the chief claim of Mr. Nichols to the attention of Erasmian scholars. He is the first person to undertake, upon a basis of wide and accurate scholarship, a chronological arrangement of all the letters for this period which should make them more intelligible to the reader. In this attempt he had for parts of his work, it is true, two German forerunners, whose work he acknowledges and whose results he compares with his own; but his work has been done independently and his results vary considerably from theirs. The principles of his chronological order for all the letters in both volumes were set forth in the first, so that the second now before us is of less importance in this respect. The letters here given are those considered by Max Reich in his dissertation of the year 1896 with a few additions from English sources. They include the most important single letters, for example, that to Prior Servatius of July, 1514, and that to "Grunnius", which Mr. Nichols places as probably written in August, 1516. These two letters, on which pretty much the whole of the traditional biography of Erasmus is based, are brought into serious question by Mr. Nichols's criticism. He admits with hesitation the genuineness of the former and distinctly regards the latter as a genuine fabrication—if we may use the word—that is, he thinks it was written by Erasmus, but to a fictitious person and designedly so constructed as to gain a point in his suit for favor at the papal court. Its weight as serious biographical material is therefore obviously diminished.

The running commentary occupies proportionally less space in this volume, but is sufficiently full to show the relation of the letters to the general course of events which called them forth. An appendix

gives for the first time the original text of several short familiar letters to English correspondents on matters of no great importance. On the whole this volume fairly maintains the interest roused by the first and must be regarded as a highly important contribution to the whole subject of the New Learning.

E. E.

*Bygone London Life, Pictures from a Vanished Past*, by G. L. Apperson, I. S. O. (New York, James Pott and Company, 1904, pp. xii, 170), is an industrious collection of odds and ends illustrative of the life of London in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The author has evidently depended for both matter and illustrations on Ashton's *Social Life in the Reign of Queen Anne* and other standard authorities. The especial value of Apperson's treatment is the literary point of view. The restaurants and coffee-houses, and their frequenters, the swells and beaux and macaronies, are depicted by aid of the memoirs, letters, and society verse of that day. The effect is much like that of a visit to one of the quaint old museums described in chapter iv. Fashionable London of two centuries gone is as alien to Londoners of to-day as are the wax figures of Madame Tussaud's collection. The life of a great metropolis is artificial at best, with a perversity that grows by what it feeds on. Existence beyond the city gates, the normal occupations and rustic joys of the provinces, are dull past endurance. The fashionable Londoner of Addison's day knew nothing of the spiritual awakening heralded by the Wesleys, nothing of the industrial revival consequent on the invention of the spinning-jenny and the power-loom. His horizon was bounded by the chimney-tops.

The latter-day Englishman is a peculiarly nature-loving creature, and his country house is a truer exponent of his intellectual and social life than the house in London. The young gentleman ambitious of social favor devotes himself to cricket, tennis, and politics, and gives more attention to conversational resources than to clothes. In nothing, perhaps, is the contrast between eighteenth-century and twentieth-century Londoners more clearly seen than in the attitude toward the unprivileged classes. Eighteenth-century literature concerns itself with the proletariat only as they served the needs of fashionable society—the drawers, the linkboys, the shoeblacks, the town-criers, the watermen. The development of a social conscience has rendered impossible the lawlessness and insolence of the “bucks and bloods” of Fleet Street. Concern for the order and cleanliness of the city has become the dominant note in London politics. A man like Charles James Fox would have been at home in the England of to-day. Born in the eighteenth century, a macaroni of the macaronies, the splendid Radical wasted his genius in senseless dissipation. Nothing in the gayety or charm of the London of the Georges can atone for the inevitable waste of human souls.

KATHARINE COMAN.

*Le Grand Bureau des Pauvres de Paris au milieu du XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle. Contribution à l'Histoire de l'Assistance Publique.* Par Léon Cahen. [Bibliothèque d'Histoire Moderne. Volume I, Fascicule III.] (Paris, Société Nouvelle de Librairie et d'Édition, 1904, pp. 80.) The archives of the *Grand Bureau des Pauvres* were destroyed by fire in 1871, but there remain a number of documents illustrating its history among the Joly de Fleury papers in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Several members of the Joly de Fleury family filled the office of *procureur général* during the eighteenth century, and since public charity was a matter of police these papers were collected in the course of the official duties of the *procureur* as supervisor of charitable institutions. They form the foundation of the interesting study which M. Cahen has made of the organization, activity, finances, and abuses of one of the most prominent agencies for poor relief in Paris under the *ancien régime*. The *Grand Bureau* comprised three separate establishments: the bureau proper, which granted a weekly pittance as out relief to a limited number of aged persons; the *Hospice des Petites Maisons*, which received the very aged, some diseased, and the insane; and finally the *Hospice de la Trinité*, an orphan asylum which gave industrial training outside of gild control. The poor of the industrial and mercantile classes were the chief beneficiaries; the administration was inelastic and burdensome, since the services of the *commissaires des pauvres* were gratuitous but compulsory; the poor tax was inequitably assessed; the relief given was meager and the conditions of grant and discipline were strict. But the facts presented scarcely justify the epithet of "charité inique" which the author applies. The principles of relief and administration which to M. Cahen appear curious and unusual offer nothing unfamiliar to a student of the history of organized public charity during this period. Nevertheless this clearly written monograph is a useful contribution to the subject.

EDWIN F. GAY.

*A Later Pepys.* Edited by Alice C. C. Gaussen. (New York, John Lane, 1904, 2 vols., pp. xi, 425; ix, 414.) The letters included in these two handsomely bound and finely illustrated volumes have been selected from the correspondence of Sir William Pepys between the years 1758 and 1825. Sir William Pepys was a descendant of the elder branch of the family to which Samuel Pepys belonged, and was generally well-known in the latter part of the eighteenth century as a friend, and in some cases the intimate, of distinguished literary characters of the period. His letters are therefore primarily of literary interest, very little reference being made in them to ordinary political or social conditions of the times, even the stirring events of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars receiving but scant notice. As for the letters themselves, they have so little in common with the diaries of Samuel Pepys that the title chosen by the editor seems a misnomer. No doubt Sir William Pepys was "A Later Pepys", but the name of Sir William's



more distinguished relative has come to mean a body of historical source-material on the reign of Charles II, rather than the name of a man, while these letters practically contain no such material whatever for any period, save in relation to literature. The only direct historical interest is in the occasional references to contemporary historical writers and criticisms upon them. The naïve candor of the earlier Pepys is wholly lacking in these later letters, for they are very formally and painstakingly composed. Yet in spite of this they frequently do present some striking incident, or some intimate characterization of figures in the field of contemporaneous literature. In this connection alone are they valuable for the student of history.

E. D. ADAMS.

*The Provincial Committees of Safety of the American Revolution.* By Agnes Hunt, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History, Wells College, formerly Instructor in History, College for Women, Western Reserve University. (Published from the Income of the Francis G. Butler Publication Fund, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, 1904, pp. 180.) Every year it is becoming clearer that a satisfactory general history of American society must rest on the basis of a precedent monographic literature which shall exhaustively examine every part of the original evidence. In particular the dissertations and other academic monographs—the worthy product of the quarter of a century of American graduate study—are discharging a very important scientific function. Already through their aid the foundations of a true national history are being laid. Nowhere has such microscopic research shed more light or exposed more error than in the field of the American Revolution. We are really beginning to have some accurate knowledge of the origins of our national institutions.

To this class of investigations has now been added Dr. Hunt's careful examination of the committees of safety. It is significant of the slow progress of inquiry that hitherto these executive bodies, so vitally important in the organization and direction of the Revolution, have never received special treatment. The present work comprises five chapters. In the first three the committees or councils of safety in the New England, the middle, and the southern colonies respectively are dealt with; the fourth presents a general view of the character and work of these bodies; while the fifth and last seeks their origin in preceding English and colonial experience. The investigation rests almost wholly upon the sources; and the result is thoroughly enlightening for many important questions connected with the struggle for independence. Thus we are able to contrast the good results of the humane, even magnanimous treatment of the Tories in New Hampshire and Connecticut with the bad results of the contrary policy pursued in New York. Especially instructive is the disclosure of the close relation existing between these provincial and state executive bodies and the various town, county, or other local committees. "In the heat of common enthusiasm

and patriotism the parts were welded for a time. If the Revolution had been merely the plan of a few leaders, it would have been impossible for it to have made headway, since voluntary co-operation was the source of whatever unity existed." Moreover, after the commencement of hostilities, the committees of safety "replaced to some extent the old committees of correspondence"; and it is not the least service of this helpful monograph to have shown that "in a much larger degree than is often realized" the success of the Revolution depended upon their work.

The text is supplemented by a useful bibliography and a comparative "Table of the Powers of the Committee of Safety" for all the provinces.

GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD.

*La Fayette dans la Révolution, 1775-1799.* Par Henri Doniol. (Paris, Armand Colin, 1904, pp. 139.) This is a republication in book form of the author's article "La Fayette avant l'Année 1800", which appeared a few months since in the *Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique* (XVII, 489-532); it comprises a brief study of two phases of Lafayette's career: his part in the American Revolution, and his attitude toward the French Revolution.

In reviewing Lafayette's part in the American Revolution, M. Doniol simply summarizes the conclusions he arrives at in his *Histoire de la Participation de la France à l'Établissement des États-Unis*. Lafayette's desire to fight the English, "cette insolente nation" (p. 45), is emphasized as the motive of his American adventure, rather than enthusiasm for liberty (yet cf. *Mémoires, Correspondance*, etc., letter of May 30, 1777, to Mme. de Lafayette). Indeed, it is probable, according to M. Doniol, though not certain, that Lafayette intended to promote the Comte de Broglie's scheme of a stadholderate for himself in the revolted colonies. The attempts of the French government to prevent Lafayette's departure for America were so much pretense (p. 23). Lafayette was the author of Rochambeau's expedition in 1780.

The second part of M. Doniol's study was occasioned by the appearance of the *Correspondance Inédite de La Fayette, Lettres de Prison, Lettres d'Exil, 1793-1801*, by Jules Thomas (Paris, 1903). Upon his return to France during the consulate, Lafayette had set about collecting these fugitive bits of correspondence, with a view of publishing them. Thus would he justify himself to his countrymen, many of whom regarded him as a traitor to the Revolution; thus would he replenish his purse. The intervention of the empire removed the urgency of the former motive, and in 1812 Romeuf, to whom had been assigned the rôle of editor, perished at Moscow. The manuscript was not recovered for the *Mémoires, Correspondance et Manuscrits* of 1837-1838, though much of its matter was supplied from other sources. M. Doniol is interested in the newly recovered documents because he thinks they refute the charge that Lafayette wished to keep the Revolution *bourgeois*

and monarchical (pp. 66-67). It is doubtful, however, if the few sentences that M. Doniol is able to muster for his purpose (pp. 108-112) suffice to overthrow the impression created by Lafayette's conduct from May, 1789, to August, 1792. It might be wished that M. Doniol had connected the two parts of his study with an attempt to show the effect that Lafayette's American experience had upon his later career at home. The reference to "9 thermidor 1793" on page 74 is doubtless to 9 Thermidor, 1794.

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

*The Writings of James Madison.* Edited by Gaillard Hunt. Volume V, 1787-1790. (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904, pp. xvi, 461.) Mr. Hunt's third and fourth volumes, consisting chiefly of Madison's notes of debates in the Federal Convention, brought us down to the date of its adjournment in September, 1787. The present volume carries us but two years and a half farther. So fully has this important period in Madison's life been already illustrated, that of a hundred and eight letters printed by Mr. Hunt there are only a dozen that have not been printed before. The old letters call for no comment here. Of the new, six come from the Madison Papers, two from the collections of the New York Public Library, two from the Virginia Historical Society, one from a North Carolina source, and one, a letter of some interest written to Philip Mazzei, was once the property of Guizot and is now in a private collection in Berlin. Those of the new letters which are addressed to the father and brother of Madison are not of much importance. Those to Archibald Stuart are distinctly interesting; e. g., there is a present-day interest in the judgment (p. 417, note), apropos of the writer's desire that senators should be better paid than members of the House, that "with equal emoluments the ablest men will prefer the House of Representatives, and the Senate will degenerate into an unfitness for the great dignity of its institution". Interesting also is a letter to Henry Lee setting forth the advantages of the town-site at the Great Falls of the Potomac (pp. 321-324). The letter to Mazzei (pp. 267-269), after a brief defense of Madison's support of the new Constitution, gently leads his correspondent away from the suggestion he had apparently advanced, that he might be usefully employed as minister of the United States to the Netherlands or Italy.

Madison's speeches in the Virginia Convention occupy nearly a fourth of the volume. His speeches in the first two sessions of the First Congress, running to nearly as great extent, are also given. They are reprinted from the *Annals of Congress*, though it seems likely that the sources used for that compilation are still available.

The journals of the House of Delegates for 1787 being in print, it is not necessary to search in manuscripts for the important resolutions of October 31, quoted here on page 51. Page 252, line 4, Gilpin's reading "unadvised" makes better sense than "unavoided". The letter

to Pendleton printed on page 405 is listed in the table of contents as addressed to Randolph. Mr. Hunt's annotations are apposite and intelligent.

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON.

*Wellington, Soldier and Statesman, and the Revival of the Military Power of England.* [Heroes of the Nations.] By William O'Connor Morris. (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904, pp. xix, 398.) This is a hopelessly mediocre book. To do him justice, the author does not put forward any pretension to exact scholarship, and has apparently not even read Wellington's despatches, confining himself to Colonel Gurwood's selection. He is at his best when he contents himself with adopting a sound authority, as for instance between Vimeiro and Talavera, where he generally follows Professor Oman. The book has not even the redeeming feature that is to be found in some attempts to popularize history—a correct, agreeable, and lucid style. Judge Morris's account of the Peninsular War is not, even in that respect, to be mentioned in the same breath with that of Professor Oman. His looseness, superficiality, and inaccuracy appear at their worst in the account of the Waterloo campaign. As examples of his historical and literary methods, four short quotations taken from two consecutive pages (191, 192) may be cited; they refer to Napoleon's retreat from Russia and to his preparations for the campaign of 1813: "He left the wrecks of his army at Smorgone, conduct of at least a questionable kind, and gave the command to Murat, a bad choice; the retreat went on as before to Wilna. . . . Murat lost his head and had only one idea, flight. About the middle of December some 20,000 spectres crossed the Niemen in little knots. . . ." In all this nearly every detail requires correction. A little lower down the page we come to the following cryptic utterance: "York, a general of the Prussian contingent, abandoned Macdonald with his soldiers to a man." On the next page comes this astounding and totally false statement, referring to Napoleon's efforts to form a new army in 1813: "but he was earnestly seconded by the will of a united people, as strongly expressed perhaps as in 1792-93". Three lines lower we get this delightful Hibernianism: "At the same time he restored the artillery he had lost." To criticize a book of this character in extenso in this review is unnecessary; it cannot be recommended even for the instruction of the general public and school-boys

R. M. JOHNSTON.

P. Coquelle's *Napoléon et l'Angleterre, 1803-1813* (Paris, Plon-Nourrit et Cie., 1904, pp. iv, 295), is a diplomatic history based on unprinted material in the Paris archives and the British Foreign Office. The book is not without popular tendencies. A symptom of them is the division of the comparatively small volume into no less than thirty-seven chapters. The work in fact is not for students or scholars alone, it is addressed to all interested in the Napoleonic time. The characteristic feature of the book is that the author, unlike most French his-

torians, ascribes uniformly to Napoleon the failure of his negotiations with England. Without depreciating the author's case against Napoleon, one may note that converts have a tendency not absent here; the pendulum has swung too far. Even to English readers M. Coquelle at times, were he less convinced, would be more convincing. Concerning the rupture of the Peace of Amiens he adduces seven unprinted, confidential letters of Andréossy. The first was written in January, and the last in April, 1803. Repeatedly in them the ambassador assured Napoleon that England desired peace. These assurances may account in part for the rupture. They would tempt Napoleon, if not zealous of peace, to press claims that jeopardized a settlement. The negotiation of 1806 culminated in Lord Yarmouth's *projet* of July 31, which yielded Sicily. The *projet* was printed after sixty years, in the *Correspondance de Napoléon*. At the time it was omitted from the published papers of the negotiation by both England and Napoleon. Apparently they feared to admit, the one, that she had made so good an offer, the other, that he had refused it. With Napoleon the negotiation practically ended when he learned in September that Alexander would not ratify the separate peace with Russia signed by d'Oubril at Paris, against Lord Yarmouth's protest, on July 20. Lefebvre's view, that Lord Lauderdale's mission in Paris was to curb pacific tendencies in Yarmouth, the author rejects with reason. In Parliament Lauderdale had been a champion of peace, and to this fact was due his failure of reflection as a representative peer of Scotland. He was not a diplomat. As a souvenir of their failure to restore peace he offered the French negotiator a sword of English manufacture. Champagne, with almost as little tact, declined it. The Austro-Russian attempts at mediation in 1807, here discussed at length, ended in Starhemberg's withdrawal from London in January, 1808. England insisted, not unreasonably, that the proposed negotiation should take place elsewhere than in Paris. Ten months later Napoleon yielded the point in his overture after Erfurt. He even invited England to bring to a negotiation her allies. Canning's reply proposed to include delegates of the Spanish insurgents, an interpretation of the overture equivalent with Napoleon to its rejection. The book concludes with the secret negotiations of 1810 and the negotiations at Morlaix in the same year. The former, initiated by Fouché without Napoleon's knowledge, ended in the minister's disgrace; those at Morlaix were an unsuccessful attempt to arrange a general exchange of prisoners.

*George Canning*. By W. Alison Phillips. (New York, Dutton, London, Methuen, 1903, pp. xi, 185.) The author of this brief biography has drawn his information wholly from old and well-known sources and secondary works, and even in this field it is evident that his study has been but cursory for the earlier part of Canning's career. In particular he underestimates the importance of Canning's relations with America in connection with the orders in council, and makes

several absurd errors in fact and in generalization. Thus the *Chesapeake* appears as a merchant-vessel offering armed resistance to a British war-vessel; Erskine is confused with Rose as a special negotiator on points in dispute between the United States and England; and American purpose is depicted as "the playful policy of 'twisting the lion's tail'". Instead of recognizing, as have most English writers, the insulting arrogance displayed by Canning toward the United States, the controversies between the two countries are regarded as "annoyances arising from the aggressive attitude of a young nation as ignorant, as it was intolerant, of the traditional code of international courtesy" (p. 72). This sounds more like the judgment of a contemporary partizan than of a careful biographer. But when Mr. Phillips comes to Canning's last ministry, he manifests a very clear grasp of essential facts and purposes. The conditions of English and European diplomacy from 1822 to 1827 are here treated simply yet thoroughly, while the interesting thesis is maintained and apparently proved that Canning's actions in regard to Spain, the Spanish colonies, and Greece were dictated by no tendency toward liberalism, but by a peculiarly insular patriotism. Far from having any enthusiasm for the cause of Greek independence, Canning, Mr. Phillips thinks, would have deeply regretted the escape of that country from the domination of Turkey, had he lived to see it. His horizon was bounded by British interests. "Sentiment had but little place in his nature. It had none in his policy." In form, arrangement, and style the book is excellent.

E. D. ADAMS.

Several volumes, VII-XII, of *Early Western Travels*, edited by R. G. Thwaites (Arthur H. Clark Company) have recently appeared. The first of these contains a reprint of the original edition (London, 1849) of Alexander Ross's *Adventures of the First Settlers on the Oregon or Columbia River*. Ross, as the editor tells us, was a Scotchman who, in 1804, set out to seek his fortunes in Canada. In 1810 he embarked with the Astorian expedition, and, upon arriving at the Columbia river, was assigned to a post in the interior. Here, for the three years (1810-1813) covered by his account, he studied the Indian language and characteristics and wrote much in his journal. The narrative, as we have it, was based on the journals kept at the time, but it was not published until 1849. It supplements, as a source for the history of the first attempt to colonize for the United States the northwest coast, the narrative of Gabriel Franchère, published in volume VI of this series. Ross's interest in topography was slight, but the account contains much of ethnological value. Its chief importance, however, is for the story of the Astorian expedition. Volume VIII contains two reprints: *Voyages, Travels and Discoveries of Tilly Buttrick, Jr.* (Boston, 1831), and *A Pedestrian Tour, of Four Thousand Miles, through the Western States and Territories, during the Winter and Spring of 1818*, by Estwick Evans (Concord, N. H., 1819). The first of these covers the years

1812-1819, and is the narrative of travels through New York, down the Allegheny and Ohio to Cincinnati; from Kentucky down the Mississippi to New Orleans; and north over the Natchez trail. The hardships of pioneers, the devastations of the War of 1812, the conditions of life along the rivers—all are vividly portrayed. Evans's tour led him from New Hampshire to Detroit, down the Allegheny, Ohio, and Mississippi to New Orleans, and home by sea. He was "keenly alert for all manner of information that bore upon the war, the state of agriculture, the topography and settlement of the country, and the general industrial conditions". Volume IX contains *Letters from America* (1818-1820), by James Flint (Edinburgh, 1822). Flint was a Scotchman of education who came to America for the express purpose of observing conditions. He was particularly interested in the middle west, and after stopping in New York and Philadelphia, he passed through Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky, and lived for several months in Jeffersonville, Indiana. He made a careful study of political and social conditions, but economic phenomena especially received his attention. His observations are discriminating, the criticisms dispassionate, the generalizations intelligent.

The accounts of the west that appear in the other volumes so far published, X, XI, XII, center around the colony of English emigrants that, promoted by two Englishmen of substance, Morris Birkbeck and George Flower, was established in southeastern Illinois at a place known later as English Prairie. The agricultural distress and political unrest at the close of the Napoleonic wars had led to the establishment of the colony. The same causes kept the eyes of Englishmen upon the experimental community and involved it in a war of pamphlets, in which William Cobbett was a leading and hostile spirit. Some of the reprints in the three volumes are thus marred by rancor, but, discounting that, give good accounts of the crude but prospering west. Volume X contains four reprints. Thomas Hulme's *Journal of a Tour in the Western Countries of America—September 30, 1818-August 8, 1819*, is removed from its original setting as a part of William Cobbett's diatribe *A Year's Residence in the United States of America* (London, 1828). The *Journal* is that of an honest English farmer bent on examining agricultural and social conditions, and his notes taken while he traveled over the Pennsylvania road and down the Ohio and through Illinois contain shrewd, useful, and, on the whole, favorable observations. Richard Flower, the father of the founder of the English Prairie settlement, who joined his son there in 1819, is represented by two reprints: *Letters from Lexington and the Illinois* (London, 1819) and *Letters from the Illinois* (London, 1822). He was "a man of culture and refinement" and his *Letters* are valuable on account of their sanity. He freely criticized slave institutions. Most of volume X however is devoted to *Two Years' Residence . . . in the Illinois Country* (London, 1822), by John Woods, a well-to-do English farmer, whose observations and impressions cover the years 1819-1821. He and his family traveled to Wheeling, thence took a flat-boat to Shawneetown, and thence walked to English Prairie.



He saw things in a favorable light, and his record on the life of the backwoodsmen and on the condition of the Ohio river towns is of distinct value.

Volumes XI and XII are devoted to William Faux's *Memorable Days in America* (London, 1823) and Adlard Welby's book, *A Visit to North America and the English Settlements in Illinois, with a Winter Residence at Philadelphia* (London, 1821). According to the editor, these two books were chosen for reprint, "in order to show what English provincials, predisposed toward quiet, orderly, rural life in Britain, found to annoy and disgust them in the seething, turbulent frontier West". Faux's observations were made in 1818-1819. After visits to the coast cities he spent two months in Illinois. He was brutally frank, and generalized, to the disadvantage of the west, from exceptional cases of depravity and injustice. Welby's account was also unfavorable, due possibly to his conservative disposition. Both, however, throw valuable light on western conditions and, taken in connection with some reprints in earlier volumes of the same series, may form "an interesting contrast", and "a drastic corrective".

*A Political and Constitutional Study of the Cumberland Road.* By Jeremiah Simeon Young, A.M. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1904, pp. 107). The object of the author of this volume is to trace the origin, construction, administration, and surrender of the Cumberland road, keeping in mind two points of view: political influences, and constitutional bearing and significance. The treatment is in the main historical. About a third of the book is devoted to an account of the "early transportation difficulties", the "genesis" of the road, and the "location, construction, and administration of the road". Nothing new is presented here. It is, however, a clear and concise statement of the facts. The rest of the book is devoted to a discussion of the constitutional questions involved. The Cumberland road is treated as "a central thread running through the subject of internal improvements until 1856".

The main constitutional questions arising out of the building of the Cumberland road were: (1) Did Congress have the right to appropriate the money and build the road? (2) If Congress had such a right, did it have the right to take land for the purpose within a state by eminent domain? (3) The road being built, did Congress or the state have jurisdiction over it? Each of these questions the writer takes up and discusses in a logical manner, showing the views taken by the different Presidents and leading statesmen and the policy pursued by Congress. He misstates Monroe, however, I think, when he says (p. 68), "in his [Monroe's] opinion, the power to appropriate did not carry with it the power to construct". Monroe believed that Congress had the right to appropriate for, and with the consent of the state to construct, a national road. He did not believe that Congress had any jurisdiction over a road thus built nor could the states grant Congress any such

jurisdiction. For this reason he vetoed the Gate Bill.

The style of the author is both good and bad. It is clear, but marred by numerous repetitions of lines and even paragraphs, giving us the impression that the chapters were written at widely separated times. There is, moreover, an unfortunate failure of correspondence at times between the text and citations. In several instances the wrong volume of the Congressional documents is cited, and the writer is in error when he says that Franklin county, Ohio, still charges toll on the national road. The book is a very readable and logical discussion of a most interesting subject. It is marred, however, by certain faults of style and inaccuracies in details.

ALONZO H. TUTTLE.

*The History of Negro Servitude in Illinois and of the Slavery Agitation in that State, 1719-1864.* By N. Dwight Harris, Ph.D. (Chicago, A. C. McClurg and Company, 1904, pp. xi, 276.) This is a product of extensive and painstaking inquiry into the sources, and is a valuable contribution. Little attention is given to economic matters, but the questions of law, politics, and sentiment are treated with fullness. After showing the existence of downright slavery and quasi-slavery in Illinois, with their vicissitudes, down to about 1845, the author turns to the larger issues concerning slavery in the country as a whole, and discusses the part which citizens of Illinois played in the contests. Then, laying slavery aside, he concludes with a chapter upon the progress of sentiment in Illinois on the negro question from 1840 to 1875. In matters of detail Dr. Harris seems to be fairly unimpeachable; and as a repository of information his book will have its chief use. The generalizations, which are happily not many, are often weak; and the point of view is provincial. The author would probably be materially broadened by a sojourn in the blacker portions of the cotton belt or in the rice or sugar districts.

The book is not about the negro directly, but about quarrels about the negro. We are told (p. 242) that the negro in Illinois acquired certain privileges "only gradually, and after a struggle"; but the struggle was clearly a struggle by white men and not by negroes. The passiveness of the black man is everywhere silently in evidence.

The author summarizes (pp. 241 and 240): "The people of that region [southern Illinois], as we have seen, were largely Southern in blood and sympathies. . . . These people . . . were as narrow-minded and stubborn as they were kind-hearted and hospitable." "In the southern section . . . the question is still a vital one. The negro is despised and hated as of old, and if a vote could now be taken, it would doubtless be astonishing to find what a large proportion of our citizens—not only in the south, but among the more liberal residents of the centre and north of Illinois—would ballot to deprive the negro of the right to vote or to hold office. But why this long and persistent opposition to the poor colored man?" The author explains it on the ground of race antipathy;

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. X.—45.

but he barely alludes to the inherited inequality of the races and the unfitness of negroes to conduct white men's governments. The quarrels of which the book gives a history were concerned with ideas more than with realities. Hardly realizing this, the author at times hints at fundamental things. As a sermon the book is a failure; as a monograph it is fairly successful, in spite of its frequent changes of subject; as a collection and analysis of data it is distinctly meritorious.

ULRICH B. PHILLIPS.

The sixth report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission of the American Historical Association, being the second volume of the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1902* (Washington, 1903, pp. 527), contains the "Diary and Correspondence of Salmon P. Chase". This material was obtained by Professor Albert Bushnell Hart and others while Professor Hart was writing his life of Chase, and eventually passed into the Library of Congress. Only a selection of the correspondence has been used by the commission, and no attempt was made to obtain matter outside of this collection. Much of value and interest that was available is thus wanting, and this defect is not made good by a list of Chase's letters "elsewhere printed". It is unfortunate that a good opportunity has thus been lost. What is included in the volume is very good material, and shows Chase as the warm friend of the slave, the eager reformer, the critic of his superior, and the politician too eager for the highest office in the land. The gradual changes in his aims and character are only partially indicated, and certain phases of his career could easily have been treated in greater detail and with greater advantage to the work before us. But this defect is among the least important. Surely the American Historical Association should strive to attain the best results, if only as an example to other bodies or individuals engaged in the same line of study. The Calhoun Papers were a model of careful editing; the Chase volume has faults that are inexcusable, even allowing for the division of labor that a commission necessitates. The arrangement is very exasperating to the reader or student. The Diary (July-October, 1862) is first given; then follow Chase's letters (1846-1861); a separate section is given to Denison's letters to Chase (1862-1865); and finally come the letters to Chase from his correspondents (1842-1870). A chronological arrangement would have been more useful and consistent. This want of arrangement could in part have been made good by a fair index. The present index is so defective that we can only marvel at the publication. The omissions are really more numerous than the insertions, and in its present form it is practically useless. No attempt has been made to give the full names of individuals, and the notes, while good so far as they go, are not illuminating. To these faults of execution must be added one of taste. It is unusual for a gift to be publicly commended by the giver. Yet a member of the commission signs a report highly

praising his assumed liberality! Altogether the Association could have done better with so good material as the Chase papers offered.

G. U. E.

*The Shenandoah Valley and Virginia, 1861 to 1865: a War Study.* By Lieutenant-Colonel Sanford C. Kellogg, U. S. A. (New York and Washington, The Neale Publishing Company, 1903, pp. 247.) Colonel Kellogg was not only a writer on military subjects but also a close military student. He was the confidential aide on the staff of General George H. Thomas during the war, and member of the staff of General Sheridan while the latter was general of the army. With these advantages of inside knowledge, he was further prepared for presenting the valley campaigns by spending several summers among its people and by visits to its numerous battle-fields. The volume opens with an excellent condensation of the Confederate movements against Harpers Ferry where Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, and Joseph E. Johnston first came into prominence. The Patterson campaign receives concise and interesting treatment. This is followed by a clear and attractive account of McClellan's and Rosecrans's West Virginia campaigns. The use of the valley by the Confederates as a covered way for the notable advances of Lee, first into Maryland, and subsequently into Pennsylvania, and for Early's movement on Washington, well set forth its topographical importance on the Virginia theater of war. This fact, with the exceptional agricultural resources of the valley, is used to illustrate its vast military value to the Confederates.

Jackson's campaign of 1862 is vividly presented. Of its close, when Banks had been driven back to the Potomac, and Jackson was threatened on both flanks, Colonel Kellogg well says: "A more desperate situation, so successfully solved, would be difficult to find in the annals of war." A strong contrast is drawn between the "audacity and strategical eminence of Stonewall Jackson" and "the lack of capacity and want of cohesion on the part of his opponents". Till Sheridan came, this tells the story of the valley, as, till then, politics largely controlled the selection of those sent to command the Union forces. The difficulty of untangling the well-nigh countless and intricate movements of the campaigns sufficiently appears from the statement that Winchester was occupied or abandoned sixty-eight times by the troops of both armies.

The capitulation of Harpers Ferry presents in brief the features of the Antietam campaign; then follows a rapid review of the Jones and Imboden raid into West Virginia, the Gettysburg campaign, and the second battle of Winchester, the Averill raids of 1863, the New Market and Lynchburg campaigns, and Early's attack on Washington and return to the valley. Each of these movements, in a period which extended over two years from August, 1862, is sufficiently treated to give an intelligent view of a complicated and ever-changing situation. Then comes a lively history of Sheridan's brilliant command, including the battles of Opequon, Fisher's Hill, Tom's Brook, Cedar Creek, and the subsequent cavalry movements.

The absence of maps is a serious defect. These had been prepared with care, but were postponed to a second edition. There are, also, some minor errors which would have been corrected had Colonel Kellogg lived to revise the first edition. But he suddenly died while he had that work under consideration. Altogether, it is the most satisfactory presentation of the valley campaigns yet issued.

H. V. BOYNTON.

*The Political History of Virginia during the Reconstruction.* By Hamilton James Eckenrode. [Johns Hopkins University Studies, Series XXII, Nos. 6, 7, 8.] (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1904, pp. 128.) This work is what its title suggests; a political history of Virginia during the years 1866 to 1870. To what strange shifts are men sometimes driven by the force of circumstances! From 1861 to 1865 there were always two, and sometimes three, state governments within the bounds of Virginia, each claiming the allegiance of the people and requiring the payment of taxes. First there were the Richmond authorities with Governor Letcher at the head and supported by a legislature and regular court system—Jefferson Davis and the Confederate States recognizing this as organized Virginia; then there was during 1861 to 1863 Governor Peirpont's legislature, courts, etc., at Wheeling, claiming to be the legislative authority in the Old Dominion. Lincoln and the United States recognized this as organized Virginia; and when the western Virginians, finding themselves in a hopeless minority, seceded from the regular state government, with Peirpont's consent, the Washington government, then in a great war against the principle of secession, gladly recognized the seceders on the ground that a republican form of government did not prevail in Virginia. When Governor Peirpont finds the revolt complete he declines to be governor of the new state but still maintains that he is the lawful executive of the Old Dominion. He withdraws from Wheeling and makes the old town of Alexandria the seat of authority, the eastern shore of Virginia—two counties, Norfolk, Alexandria, and Fairfax county being the state, the governed. The President of the United States continued to regard this as Virginia.

It was this last-named nucleus of a government which came to be Virginia proper in 1865 when the seceders had been overthrown and when President Johnson began his plan of reconstruction. How this shadowy government finally came to command the allegiance of the people of the state, how the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the national Constitution received the sanction of Virginia, how, in a word, the Old Dominion was brought back into the Union on a new basis, is the task which Mr. Eckenrode sets himself. And right well has he performed it. The method of the author is truly critical, the use of the sources is satisfactory—the Richmond newspaper files being drawn upon to great advantage, and the conclusions arrived at are unquestionably justifiable and as accurate as the nature of the

subject will permit. Perhaps the most noteworthy features of the monograph are the accounts of the failure of the radical Republicans to control the situation in the *finale* of the long struggle; the manipulation of the conservative forces of the state by William Mahone, a brigadier in Lee's army; and the complete loss of prestige by one of the state's most masterful men, John Minor Botts. The author says in conclusion that the negroes gained the right to vote, to share in the public schools, to move freely from place to place, but that voting by them was so hedged about by the white race that the negro only once actually exercised potent influence on affairs. Thus the main object of the national government was not attained, as in the nature of things it could not be.

Two so-called lay sermons, by Amos Griswold Warner, dealing with important public questions, and a short biography of Warner by Professor George E. Howard, are also published in this volume.

WILLIAM E. DODD.

Two very entertaining volumes that will prove of marked interest to the general reader, and may be of considerable service to the historical student, are the *Autobiography, Memories, and Experiences of Moncure Daniel Conway* (Houghton, Mifflin, and Company, 1904). They give a detailed account of an eventful but not adventurous life from the time of the writer's birth in Virginia in 1832 down almost to the time of publication, discussing freely and intimately matters not only of personal experience, but of literary, social, and political concern. Their character is such, however, that they defy the ordinary arts of the reviewer, and, unless one could take the space to give a thorough description of their contents, he must content himself with a word of commendation for their general readableness and attractiveness. There seem to have been few movements affecting the welfare of mankind during the last sixty years in which the writer has not had his share or of which he has little or nothing to say.

*The American Constitutional System: an Introduction to the Study of the American State.* By Westel Woodbury Willoughby, Associate Professor of Political Science at the Johns Hopkins University. (New York, The Century Company, 1904, pp. xvi, 323.) This is the initial volume of a new series entitled "The American State", and is the work of the general editor of the series. Volumes the primary object of which is the description of the organization and operation of the governmental agencies of the United States cannot be criticized if they do not deal at length with matters of history; but this introductory volume, the aim of which is to disclose "the constitutional character of the American State", is quite as important from the historical as from the juristic standpoint. The first four chapters are devoted to the much-vexed question of the nature of the Union. The writer traces the growth of nationality in the United States and sets forth briefly but accurately the various views of the Union put forward from time



to time. Adopting the view that the individual states were sovereign under the Articles of Confederation, the writer finds nevertheless that their sovereignty was surrendered when they ratified the Constitution and that a new union was established, the constituent members of which could not secede. The fourth chapter is a particularly clear statement in brief compass of the theory and practice of secession, coercion, and reconstruction.

In a series of illuminating chapters, the writer discusses such important phases of our constitutional system as "The Supremacy of Federal Law", "Federal Control of State Governments", "Federal and State Autonomy", "Federal and State Powers", and "Coercion of State Action". Throughout he sustains his argument by extensive citations from the opinions of the Supreme Court. Especially valuable are the chapters dealing with the questions growing out of the annexation of territory and the relations with our new dependencies. In treating the Insular Tariff Cases the argument of the dissenting justices is stated *in extenso*, since the writer shares with many the belief that the opinion of the minority is the better law and may yet prevail.

It is a pleasure to commend this little volume for its clear arrangement, its lucidity of statement, and its accuracy. In saying (p. 166) that Congress has exercised "to but a comparatively slight extent" its power to control the election of members of Congress, the author seems to have overlooked the fact that Congress has exhausted its authority over the election of senators (*U. S. Statutes at Large*, XIV, 243). The Dred Scott case was decided in 1857, not 1856 (p. 243); Ohio was admitted to the Union in 1803, not 1802 (p. 265); and Utah in 1896, not 1894 (p. 266).

LAWRENCE B. EVANS.

*The Police Power, Public Policy, and Constitutional Rights.* By Ernst Freund, Professor of Jurisprudence and Public Law in the University of Chicago. (Chicago, Callaghan and Company, The University of Chicago Press, 1904, pp. xcii, 819.) Professor Freund has chosen an elusive subject. What is the police power? The courts have been cautious in setting bounds to it by attempts at definition. In the License Cases (5 Howard's Reports, 583) Chief-justice Taney remarks that the police powers of a state "are nothing more or less than the powers of government inherent in every sovereignty to the extent of its dominions". Professor Freund would differentiate it from other governmental powers, as being that which aims directly to secure and promote the public welfare, and does so by restraint and compulsion with respect to the use of liberty and property (pages iii and 3). It may be doubted whether the distinctions thus suggested exist. Government exists legitimately only to promote the public welfare, and its laws are imperfect unless they carry some sanction tending to restrain the liberty or take from the property of those who may violate them. The essence of the police power, he says subsequently (pp. 6, 31), is



that it prevents wrong-doing by narrowing common-law rights through conventional restraints and positive regulations not confined to the prohibition of wrong-doing. This is a helpful suggestion. The object of the power is thus made the anticipation of a social wrong and the restraining of the individual in the interest of society from doing, under certain circumstances, what he would have a right to do under other circumstances. Its scope is presented as limited in the United States more narrowly than elsewhere by Constitutional provisions; thus excluding from it, in the main, moral, intellectual, and political movements, and whatever belongs to the realm of the ideal (pp. 9, 11, 13). Nevertheless, legislation for the special protection of the workman, in prescribing short hours, etc., may, he argues (p. 17), be vindicated as promoting a new conception of social justice, consisting in the neutralization of natural inequality by the power of the state. Little is said of the mass of police legislation in the colonial era, and comparatively little of the laws of either ancient or modern Europe.

As compared with Tiedeman's work on the same topic, Professor Freund's is both more elaborate and more philosophic. That of Alfred Russell (*AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, VII, 176) was mainly confined to American judicial decisions on measures of state police. The book treating the subject broadly from the point of view of a historical student is yet to be written.

SIMEON E. BALDWIN.

## NOTES AND NEWS

### GENERAL.

George Stephen Goodspeed, professor of comparative religion and ancient history in the University of Chicago, died in Chicago, on February 17, 1905, aged forty-five years. He was graduated from Brown University in 1880. For three years (1888-1891) he was assistant in the Semitic department of Yale University, from which institution he received the doctorate in 1891. In 1891-1892 he was a student at the University of Freiburg (Baden). He was associated with the University of Chicago from its foundation, first as associate professor and then as professor of comparative religion and ancient history. The task which he undertook, the teaching at once of ancient history and of the comparative study of religions, formed a combination unusual in the arrangements of American education. But his cultured mind and catholic sympathy enabled him not only to teach both with remarkable skill and efficiency, but to cause each to illuminate the other and both to serve in a high degree the diverse interests of the departments concerned. He was an accomplished scholar and a devoted teacher, and both as teacher and writer he exerted a large influence upon the teachers of the west by familiarizing many of them with the results of modern labors in ancient fields. He was a member of the editorial board of the *Biblical World* and of the *American Journal of Theology*. His most important writings include: *Outlines of Lectures upon the History of the Hebrews*, 1898; *Israel's Messianic Hope*, 1900; *Babylonians and Assyrians*, 1902; *A History of the Ancient World*, 1904.

W. Fraser Rae, known to historical students especially by his writings concerning Sheridan and by his attempt to identify the author of the "Junius Letters", died at Bath, England, on January 22.

Among the recent deaths which will be especially regretted by historical students is that of Paul Tannery, distinguished for his work on the history of the sciences, and that of Henri Michel, who occupied himself especially with the history of political doctrines. Both of these scholars were at an age when much could still be expected from them; Michel's doctoral thesis, on *L'Idée de l'État*, was published but ten years ago.

Edward John Payne, the well-known writer on early American history, was drowned December 26, 1904, at Wendover, England. His best-known work is his *History of the New World called America*. He contributed to the first volume of the *Cambridge Modern History* two chapters, "The Age of Discovery" and "The New World", and in other ways did valuable service in his chosen field.

It is reported that the French Geographic Society has awarded to Henry Vignaud, secretary of the American Embassy, the Jomard prize for historical and geographical researches.

Volume I of the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1903* has just appeared in the government publications (58th Congress, 2d session, House Document No. 745). The volume published contains the address of the President, Henry C. Lea, on "Ethical Values in History"; several of the papers read and discussed at the New Orleans meeting; a contribution by William R. Shepherd of Columbia University on the "Spanish Archives and their Importance for the History of the United States"; the Justin Winsor prize essay of 1903, by Dr. Louise Phelps Kellogg, entitled "The American Colonial Charter"; a list of 754 official Congressional papers issued between the years 1789 and 1817, the work of General A. W. Greely. Over one-third of the volume is devoted to the very valuable report of the Public Archives Commission, showing the condition and contents of the archives of Colorado, Georgia, Mississippi, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Virginia. Volume II, which is to contain selections from the correspondence of the French ministers to the United States, 1791-1797, has not yet appeared.

The *Vierteljahrschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, now entering on the third year of its existence, deserves to be more widely known in this country. Under new management since 1902, it takes the place of the *Zeitschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, which, starting in 1893, aimed to create a center for monographs, literary reviews, and bibliographies on economic history. From the beginning, the number of foreign contributors to the *Zeitschrift* was considerable, and bibliographical articles on recent Dutch, Hungarian, French, Spanish, Italian, Anglo-American, and Russian literature were published. In the new periodical the cosmopolitan features have become more prominent. Four chief languages are admitted, and accordingly the review has acquired four permanent foreign representatives. Contributions in English and treating of English economic history should be sent to Professor P. Vinogradoff, 39 St. Margaret's Road, Oxford. The *Vierteljahrschrift* is divided into three parts: articles, reviews and bibliographies, and notes. Separate contributions cannot here be mentioned. They cover a large field of subjects, stretching chronologically from the later Roman empire to the middle of the nineteenth century. Some of them are of capital importance and in the list of contributors are many leaders of contemporary historical research. Discussions of theoretical problems of economics, as well as those of economic policy, are excluded, since the review desires to remain strictly historical, confining itself to economic history, the history of economics, and to what the Germans call *historische Methodologie und Erkenntnisstheorie*—a sufficiently wide domain. A severe critic might make some strictures on the completeness and the selection of reviews and bibliographies, but he must recognize the generally high standard of the periodical, and he will welcome the fact that the *Vierteljahrschrift* makes for concentration of studies and methodical research.

*The Story of Art throughout the Ages*, by S. Reinach (New York, Scribners, 1904, pp. xi, 316), is a clever and valuable rapid sketch written by an authority. It is a handbook or general compendium, likely to be of great value as a guide to the inexperienced in the study of art. Scores of small illustrations add greatly to the usefulness of the text.

#### ANCIENT HISTORY.

The publication of a *History of Egypt*, extending from the earliest times to the conquest by Alexander the Great, has been undertaken by the Committee of the Institute of Archæology at Liverpool.

Seven studies relating to the economic history of Greece and Rome form a small volume lately issued by M. Paul Guiraud, through Hachette, Paris: *Études Économiques sur l'Antiquité*. They aim to set before the general public the importance of economic questions in ancient times, some things concerning the development of industry in Greece, the population of Greece, the conditions and problems confronting the Greeks and the Romans in matters of finance, and close with a treatment of Roman imperialism.

The edition of the Theodosian Code which Mommsen was able all but to finish before his death has begun to appear, through the house of Weidmann, Berlin. Volume I contains "Prolegomena" and part of the text.

The eighty-fourth fascicle of the "Bibliothèque" of the French schools of Athens and Rome is devoted to a work upon Roman Carthage, from 146 B. C. to 698 A. D.: *Carthage Romaine*, by A. Audollent (Paris, Fontemoing).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. Pichon, *Revue Générale. Littérature Latine (Les Textes et les Sources)* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, December); A. H. J. Greenidge, *The Authenticity of the Twelve Tables* (English Historical Review, January).

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

The source of information utilized for the announcement in the January number of the REVIEW of two aftermath volumes by Freeman proves to be erroneous in one particular. These volumes relate to Europe in the fifth and eighth centuries, rather than in the fifteenth and eighteenth.

The publication of a medieval history of the same general character as the *Cambridge Modern History* has been decided upon by the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press. It is expected that there will be six volumes, and that the first volume will be issued shortly after the completion of the *Modern History*. Professor Bury has been asked to prepare a plan for consideration, and the names of the editors will be announced later.

Dr. Ludwig Pastor is following up his long work on the history of the popes since the close of the Middle Ages with a series of hitherto unpublished documents upon papal history, especially in the fifteenth,

sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries: *Ungedruckte Akten zur Geschichte der Päpste vornehmlich im XV., XVI. und XVII. Jahrhundert*. The first volume, lately published, applies to the years 1376-1464 (Freiburg i. Br., Herder).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Fry, *Roncesvalles* (English Historical Review, January); W. Ohr, *Alte und neue Irrtümer über das karolingische Staatskirchentum* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, January); K. Wenck, *War Bonifaz VIII. ein Ketzer* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCIV, 1).

#### MODERN HISTORY.

The religious wars of the sixteenth century form the subject of the latest addition (volume III) to the *Cambridge Modern History*. The editors take the occasion of the issue of this volume to announce the intention of the Syndics of the University Press to supplement the twelve narrative volumes comprised in the original plan of the work by two volumes of auxiliary matter, one including maps and the other genealogies, tables, and a general index to the entire work.

The writings and activities of Voltaire against religious intolerance, with something of their aftermath, are the burden of a small octavo volume published recently through the Librairie Fischbacher, Paris: *Voltaire et l'Intolérance Religieuse*.

The rôle played by Philip of Bourbon, son-in-law of Louis XV, in the sundry details of French diplomacy in the eighteenth century, is treated in a small volume lately published by the house of L. Cerf, Paris; *Dom Philippe de Bourbon et Louise-Elisabeth de France*, by Henry Sage.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Willaert, *Négociations Politico-Religieuses entre l'Angleterre et les Pays-Bas Catholiques (1598-1625)* (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, beginning in January); A. Bourguet, *Les Débuts d'un Ministère. Le Duc de Choiseul et l'Autriche* (Revue Historique, January); G. Gautherot, *Un Casus Belli Franco-Helvétique en 1792 et 1793. La Neutralité de la Principauté de Bâle* (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); G. Gallavresi, *Le Prince de Talleyrand et le Cardinal Consalvi. Une Page peu Connue de l'Histoire du Congrès de Vienne* (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); W. Lang, *Die preussisch-italienische Allianz von 1866* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCIV, 2).

#### GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

The *Genealogist* for 1904 contains the usual amount and variety of matter; some three hundred or more pages of articles, notices of books, notes and queries, and illustrations, and in addition two apparently exhaustive indexes of persons and places. Its pages bear constant witness of painstaking work and many of them will be of use to historians as well as genealogists. This periodical is edited by H. W. Forsyth Harwood and published by George Bell and Sons at London and by William Pollard and Company at Exeter.

It is hoped that a long-existing gap in literature upon the Great Charter may be filled by the exhaustive work which Dr. W. S. McKechnie, of the University of Glasgow, is just publishing through Messrs. MacLehose, of Glasgow: *Magna Carta: a Commentary on the Great Charter of John*. The last such book on this subject dates from 1829. Along with this work should be mentioned *The Magna Carta of the English and of the Hungarian Constitution*, a comparison and commentary, by E. Hantos (London, Paul).

A new edition of George M. Trevelyan's *England in the Age of Wycliffe* has recently appeared (New York, Longmans). The book was well received when it was first issued, and the present revision will undoubtedly be welcome to scholars. Lamenting his inability to make all the alterations he would like to make, the author especially acknowledges in his preface his indebtedness to the articles by Mr. Kriehn on the Peasants' Rising that were printed in volume VII of the REVIEW.

A handsome reprint of "Leycesters Commonwealth", 1641, has been published by Messrs. Longmans, Green, and Company: *Queen Elizabeth, Amy Robsart and the Earl of Leicester* (pp. xv, 242), edited by Frank J. Burgoyne, librarian of the Lambeth Public Libraries. This work was first printed in 1584, somewhere on the continent; attracted forthwith enough interest to be translated into French and into Latin within a year; and encountered vigorous proscription in England. The queen found it necessary to repudiate officially the assertions contained in the work; and Leicester's nephew, Sir Philip Sidney, wrote an indignant answer to it. Its interest at least, if not its character, is sufficiently attested by Sir Philip's declaration that it was "one of the most inveterate and scurrilous libels which the religious dissensions of the times, prolific as they were, had produced."

The basis of *Great Englishmen of the Sixteenth Century*, by Sidney Lee (Scribners, 1904), is eight lectures delivered at the Lowell Institute. The lectures, the author tells us, have been materially altered. The chapter most interesting to historical students is probably the one on the Spirit of the Sixteenth Century. The other chapters are biographical, but the historical setting is not ignored; they are entitled: Sir Thomas More, Sir Philip Sidney, Sir Walter Raleigh, Edmund Spenser, Francis Bacon, Shakespeare's Career, and Foreign Influences on Shakespeare. The book is a valuable, because a readable and thoughtful, contribution to the history of the times.

A German scholar, Albert von Ruville, has just brought out a three-volume biography of the elder Pitt: *William Pitt, Graf von Chatham* (Stuttgart and Berlin, J. G. Cotta).

The third instalment of four volumes, IX to XII, of the *Letters of Horace Walpole*, edited by Mrs. Paget Toynbee (Clarendon Press), has appeared. This set covers the period of the Revolution, 1774-1783, and contains naturally interesting material for the historian of the period. In spite of his maddening recurrence on the most solemn occasions to unimportant fripperies and to gossip, much of which has lost

its savor, Walpole was evidently thinking deeply and well on the great questions of those days. "The world is divided", he says, "into two nations—men of sense that will be free, and fools that like to be slaves." The volumes are full of references to the war and politics, showing his disgust with the folly of the ministry and throwing light on the political, as well as the social, conditions of the time. It is sufficient to say that there is no indication that the editor has become weary in her work, for the foot-notes still contain ample information and represent much labor.

The Macmillan Company is publishing a handsome reprint of the *Diary and Letters of Madame d'Arblay* (1778-1840), with a preface and notes by Austin Dobson. Mr. Dobson's notes are very numerous, but, notwithstanding, his edition will contain only six volumes, while that by Miss Barrett, on which this new issue is based, had seven.

The January number of the *Scottish Historical Review* devotes two articles to Knox. In one, "Knox as Historian", Mr. Andrew Lang offers some critical notes on book II of Knox's *History of the Reformation in Scotland*. The other is a brief treatment of "The Influence of Knox", by D. H. Fleming. This number also contains articles on "Periodical Literature of the Eighteenth Century", by G. A. Sinclair, "Mary Queen of Scots and her Brother", by S. M. Rose, and "The Siege of Edinburgh Castle, 1689", by S. Terry.

In a volume now in the press Professor J. B. Bury treats of *The Life of St. Patrick, and his Place in History*. Messrs. Macmillan are the publishers.

The department of "Notes and Documents" in the *English Historical Review* for January contains, with other matter, the Irish abridgment of the *Expugnatio Hibernica* of Giraldus Cambrensis, now for the first time edited, from a fifteenth-century manuscript, by Whitley Stokes. The edition is accompanied by an English translation, indexes of persons and places, and a glossary of words not found in Windisch's *Wörterbuch*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: *The Tudors and the Navy* (Quarterly Review, January); *William Stubbs, Churchman and Historian* (Quarterly Review, January); *Bishop Creighton* (Edinburgh Review, January).

#### FRANCE.

M. Léopold Delisle has retired from his post as head of the National Library at Paris, and M. Marcel, director of the Beaux-Arts, has been appointed to succeed him. M. Delisle first became connected with the library in 1852 and has had the direction of it since 1874. It is to be hoped that his career as a scholar, already long and fruitful, may still be continued for many years.

The address delivered at the University of Chicago by Charles Victor Langlois in the course of his brief visit to this country last fall is published, in translation, in the February number of the *Uni-*



versity Record of the University of Chicago: "The Historic Rôle of France among the Nations." In it M. Langlois surveys from a high plane the general course of French history, and then inquires, in a generous and sympathetic but sturdy spirit, what constitutes the individuality of France among modern nations—what destiny may be hers in the collective life of humanity.

The "Bulletin" of publications relating to medieval France, which M. Auguste Molinier contributed to the *Revue Historique* for several years, is continued in a competent manner by MM. Charles Pfister and P. Lauer.

R. de Lasteyrie's very serviceable *Bibliographie des Sociétés Savantes*, the last instalment of which is appearing some twenty-five years after the first, closes, it will be recalled, with the year 1885. It is announced however that a supplement is in press which will cover the period from 1885 to 1900; and the first fascicle of a current list of such publications has already appeared, the time covered in this instance being the years 1901-1902: *Bibliographie Générale des Travaux Historiques et Archéologiques Publiés par les Sociétés Savantes de la France* (Paris, sold by E. Leroux). M. Lasteyrie now has an excellent collaborator in this work, M. A. Vidier.

We have received from Professor H. Prentout, of the University of Caen, a pamphlet of seventy-odd pages in which he gives a critical study of the capture of Caen by Edward III: *La Prise de Caen par Edouard III, 1346*. Heretofore the recital of Froissart has been the chief source for most of the little that has been written on this subject. M. Prentout now finds it possible to get information from many sources which his predecessors did not utilize at all, and is able to write an account which is both trustworthy and more adequate.

M. Imbart de la Tour, who won recognition some fourteen years ago by his monograph upon episcopal elections in medieval France, has lately published, through the house of Hachette, Paris, the first volume of a history of the Protestant Reformation in France in the sixteenth century: *Les Origines de la Réforme*. Tome I: *La France Moderne*. In this first volume he sets forth, as the title suggests, the environment of the rise of Protestantism in France; with the idea that the social transformations at the end of the middle ages furnish one of the principal causes of the change in religion—"causes which lie less in the state of religion than in that of society."

Miss Sophia H. MacLehose has continued the work which she began in *The Last Days of the French Monarchy* with a general account of the Revolution, bearing the title *From the French Monarchy to the Republic in France, 1788-1792* (Glasgow, MacLehose and Sons).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. V. Langlois, *Notices et Documents Relatifs à l'Histoire de France du XIII<sup>e</sup> et du XIV<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (*Revue Historique*, January); P. Muret, *Les Mémoires du Duc de Choiseul* (*Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, beginning in the January number); Ph. Sagnac, *La France en 1789 et les États*

*Généraux, d'après les Travaux de M. Armand Brette* (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, December); *The Fall of the Directory* (Edinburgh Review, January); Comte de Sérignan, *Le Maréchal Davout* (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); H. Houssaye, *Les Intrigues Royalistes de Fouché et de Davout après le seconde Abdication* (1815) (Revue Historique, January).

#### ITALY, SPAIN.

The *Rivista Storica Italiana*, which lately passed its twentieth milestone, has issued an index of its contents for the years 1884-1901 which is not only a striking testimony of the success of the *Rivista* but also a distinct aid to the study of Italian history: *Indice della Rivista Storica Italiana dal 1884 al 1901*, compiled by the editor, Costanzo Rinaudo, and published in two volumes (Office of the *Rivista*, Turin, 1904). This periodical, as is known, differs from most historical reviews in that it devotes itself all but wholly to matters of bibliography. It has no articles, but gives in each number competent accounts or criticisms of the most important current books relating to the history of Italy, together with full lists of current books and articles in periodicals, and a chronicle of news in the form of "notices and communications". Thus in the course of a few years the number of pieces treated or cited easily runs to many thousands, and the mere listing of their authors and titles requires several hundred pages. But once a list is made, it necessarily holds less the place of a mere table of contents than that of a bibliography. The index compiled by Professor Rinaudo comprises 22,680 entries, distributed methodically under the five principal divisions of General History, Pre-Roman and Roman Times, Middle Ages, Modern Times, and the "Risorgimento". Following this classification of separate pieces is an exhaustive list of the names of authors, with cross-references to their several productions, occupying near a hundred pages. The range and thoroughness of the work done appears also in a list of the periodicals explored, which includes above six hundred names. There is no other such repertory of historical publications relating to Italy, and this one is worthy of the hope that it may have some influence in awakening, or at least facilitating, interest in a field which has been none too much cultivated in America.

An important contribution to a period of modern Tuscan history until now little known has been made by Ersilio Michel, *F. D. Guerrazzi e le Cospirazioni Politiche in Toscana dall'Anno 1830 all'Anno 1835* (Milan, Albrighi, Segati, and Co., 1904), published as volume V in the *Biblioteca Storica del Risorgimento Italiano*, series IV. It is based largely upon unpublished documents in the public archives of Florence, Pisa, and Leghorn.

The distinguished Neapolitan historian and ex-deputy, Raffaele De Cesare, promises to publish in the early autumn a history of the last days of the temporal power of the papacy, April, 1850-September, 1870, entitled *La Fine del Potere Temporale*. It is to be in two volumes,

similar in form and size to his *La Fine del Regno*. If, as is to be expected, the new work also resembles the latter in conscientious research and impartial criticism, it will be a publication of the first importance upon a portion of nineteenth-century Italian history which no historian has yet studied critically.

An enlightening general survey of work done so far on the history of Spain appeared in the October and December numbers of the *Revue de Synthèse Historique*: "Revue Générale, Espagne", by G. Des-devises du Dezert.

#### GERMANY, SWITZERLAND.

The latest addition to the useful series of "Monographien zur Weltgeschichte" is an account, by Friedrich Koepp, of the Romans in Germany: *Die Römer in Deutschland*, illustrated in the same effective manner as the other volumes in this series.

The well-known Altmann-Bernheim collection of documents relating to German constitutional history in the middle ages was lately issued in a revised edition (the third): *Ausgewählte Urkunden zur Erläuterung der Verfassungsgeschichte Deutschlands im Mittelalter* (Berlin, Weidmann).

Der Hansische Geschichtsverein has in the press the sixth volume of its *Hansisches Urkundenbuch* and has just published the seventh volume in the third division of the *Hanzarezeesse*; and it announces the interesting news that after the society has carried out the plans already long in hand it contemplates turning its attention to the history of the towns and regions of Germany, with reference to their relations with the sea.

The Saxon Royal Historical Commission is just issuing, in its series of "Schriften", the first volume of a collection of acts and letters relating to the church policy of Duke George of Saxony: *Akten und Briefe zur Kirchenpolitik Herzog Georgs von Sachsen*, edited by F. Gesz. The matter of this first volume belongs to the years 1517-1524. The commission is also publishing just now, in the same series, the concluding part of the second volume of E. Brandenburg's *Politische Korrespondenz des Herzogs und Kurfürsten Moritz von Sachsen*. This work is thus carried through the year 1546.

The concluding volume of H. von Zwiedineck-Südenhorst's history of Germany from 1806 to 1871 is among the newer books: *Deutsche Geschichte von der Auflösung des alten bis zur Errichtung des neuen Kaiserreiches (1806 bis 1871)*, Band III. This volume treats of the period 1849-1871 (Stuttgart and Berlin, J. G. Cotta).

A beginning was made last year upon the publication of the correspondence of the Zürich reformer, Henry Bullinger, with his Grison coreligionists: *Bullingers Korrespondenz mit den Graubündnern*, edited by T. Schiess. What has appeared so far applies to the period from January, 1533, to April, 1557. It forms volume XXIII of the "Quellen zur Schweizergeschichte."

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: K. Zeumer, *Die böhmische und die bayrische Kur im 13. Jahrhundert* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCIV, 2); G. Bauch, *Flavius Wilhelmus Raimundus Mithridates. Der erste fahrende Kölner Hebraist und Humanist* (Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, III, 1); W. Stolze, *Zur Geschichte der 12 Artikel von 1525* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, January); H. Glagau, *Landgraf Philipp von Hessen im Ausgang des schmalkaldischen Krieges* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, January); C. Varrentrapp, *Meinungen in Kurhessen über das deutsche Kaisertum in den Jahren 1848 und 1849* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCIV, 1).

#### **BELGIUM, HOLLAND, NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.**

The sixth volume of Blok's history of the people of the Netherlands was published recently, at Groningen (J. B. Wolters). It covers the period from the death of William III in 1702 to the year 1795. Worthy of note also is the publication, through the same house, of the second volume of H. Blink's history of the peasants and of agriculture in the Netherlands: *Geschiedenis van den Boerenstand en den Landbouw in Nederland*. The first volume of this important work came down to the sixteenth century; the second volume brings the subject to the present time.

The Cambridge University Press has just brought out a history of the northern European states in modern times, by R. Nisbet Bain: *Scandinavia, a Political History of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, from 1513 to 1900*, in the Cambridge Historical Series.

*The Land of Riddles*, by Hugo Ganz (New York, Harpers, 1904), is made up chiefly of a series of interviews which the author obtained during a flying visit to Russia, from various discontented people whose names cannot be given. There is thus no way of controlling the truth of their statements, and, however much we may at bottom be inclined to believe what we are told, it cannot be accepted as reliable evidence.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. de Pelsmaecker, *Des Formes d'Association à Ypres au XIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle* (Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée, second series, vol. VI); J. Martin, *L'Église et l'État en Suède au Moyen Age. Des Origines à l'Union de Calmar* (Revue des Questions Historiques, January); J. F. Chance, *The Northern Question in 1717*. Part I. (English Historical Review, January).

#### **AMERICA.**

Maynard, Merrill, and Company have issued a new edition of Lalor's *Cyclopædia of Political Science*.

*Colección de libros y documentos referentes á la historia de América* is a new series of historical reprints published by Victoriano Suarez, Madrid, dealing with Spanish America. Three volumes are so far published. Volume I reprints the *Relacion de las Misiones de la Compañía de Jesus en el pais de los Maynas*, the work of a Spanish-American,

Francisco de Figueroa, prepared under Jesuitical direction. The remaining two volumes reproduce the manuscript of a layman and native, Pedro Gutierrez de Santa Clara, and recount the story of the earliest revolution in Peru. (1544-1548) against Spanish domination, under the title *Quinquenarios*. The material will run over into the next volume in the series.

Most recent government publications of interest to the student of history and of public affairs are: *Compilations of the Acts of Congress, Treaties, and Proclamations relating to Insular and Military Affairs from March 4, 1897, to March 3, 1903*; *Sherman, a Memorial*, with a memorial sketch by DeB. Randolph Keim, and a bibliography entitled "Sherman in Books"; *Compilation of Annual Appropriation Laws from 1883 to 1904, including Provisions for the Construction of All Vessels of the "New Navy"*; *Report of Robert C. Morris, Agent of the United States before the United States and Venezuelan Claims Commission*; *Proceedings of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal*; *Venezuelan Arbitrations of 1903*; *Journal of the Congress of the Confederate States of America, 1861-1865*, volume I, published from the original records in the War Department on a requisition from the United States Senate; *A Report on Labor Disturbances in the State of Colorado, 1880-1904, inclusive*, prepared by Carroll D. Wright.

The January *South Atlantic Quarterly*, in addition to several present-day articles and suggestive book-reviews, contains contributions on "John M. Daniel and Some of his Contemporaries", and "Spanish Project for the Conquest of Louisiana in 1804". In this number John Spencer Bassett announces his retirement from the position of editor. He will be succeeded by Edwin Mims and William H. Glasson, of the Trinity College faculty, as joint editors.

The twentieth volume in the "Monographien zur Weltgeschichte", *Die Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-Amerika*, by Eduard Heyck (Bielefeld, Velhagen and Klasing, 1904), is evidently an effort to give in limited compass to German readers some notion of the growth and present condition of this country. It has no marked value for American readers.

The Kohl collection of maps relating to America was fully described by Justin Winsor in 1886. He accompanied his description by references to maps not mentioned by Kohl. This collection was in 1903 transferred from the Department of State to the Library of Congress, and, to increase its value to historical students, Mr. Winsor's list has been reprinted by the Library under the direction of Philip Lee Phillips, who has added an author list of maps and a dictionary index of subjects and authors mentioned.

In the Story of the Churches series there has appeared *The Episcopalians*, by Daniel Dulany Addison (New York, The Baker and Taylor Company). About one-half of the volume deals with the history of the denomination in America.

The list of early publications promised by the Macmillan Company

includes the first volume of Edward Channing's comprehensive *History of the United States*; lives of Bryant and Prescott in the English Men of Letters series; one volume of William Garrott Brown's *History of the United States since the Civil War*, to be completed in two volumes; a translation of five lectures on the modern science of history delivered by Professor Karl Lamprecht of the University of Leipsic, to appear under the title *What is History?*; and an instalment of *The Life and Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, edited by Professor Albert H. Smyth of the Central High School of Philadelphia and to be completed in ten volumes.

The Unit Book Publishing Company has gathered together some of the important state papers under the title *National Documents*, so arranged as to illustrate the growth of our country from 1606 to the present day.

McClurg announces for early spring issue a reprint of Baron de Lahontan's *New Voyages to North America*, edited by R. G. Thwaites.

*A List of Emigrant Ministers to America, 1609-1811*, by Gerald Fothergill (London, E. Stock, 1904, pp. 65), contains 1,200 names obtained by a search in the Public Record Office through Money Books, King's Warrant Books, Treasury Papers, and Exchequer of Receipt Papers for those missionaries who were granted twenty pounds to defray expenses to the western colonies. Such a list will prove valuable to historians of the colonial period and to genealogists.

The attention of scholars should be called to the *Crown Collection of Photographs of American Maps*, selected and edited by Archer Butler Hulbert, and published in a limited edition of twenty-five sets by the Arthur H. Clark Company. The maps, as the name indicates, are photographs of maps selected from the Crown collection of manuscripts in the British Museum. The first volume, the only one as yet published, contains fifty maps of American rivers, most of them dating from about the middle of the seventeenth century; one is "a chart of the entrance to Chesapeake bay, with king James' River, Prince Henry's River and the Rappahanoc River" dated 1608. If the plan of publishing is carried out and all the important maps in the Crown collection made accessible to students in a few of the large libraries of the country, they will be of considerable service in the investigation of economic as well as of military history.

*Historic Dress in America, 1607-1800* (Philadelphia, George W. Jacobs and Company), by Elizabeth McClellan, is a bit of work in which an author and an artist have worked together to the great advantage of the reader. The text is accompanied by excellent illustrations in color, pen and ink, and half-tone, and by reproductions from photographs of rare portraits and original garments; 385 figures are shown. In an introductory chapter there is a brief description of dress in the Spanish and French settlements under Philip II and Louis XIV. The remainder of the volume is quite detailed. Its attempt at completeness and the care used in arrangement suggest that its greatest value is as a



book of reference. Therefore it is a matter of regret that references for the large number of quotations are not more frequent.

"What John Wesley was to Great Britain, Francis Asbury was to America", states Ezra Squier Tipple, editor of *The Heart of Asbury's Journal* (New York, Eaton and Mains). The work records forty-five years of labor (1771-1816) of a pioneer preacher and bishop, whose field of activity was only bounded by the confines of the country. Its chief interest is in connection with a history of early Methodism, with side-lights on manners and customs.

The United States Catholic Historical Society publishes two articles of general historical interest in the *Historical Records and Studies* for December, 1904. "The Waldseemüller Map of 1507", which is accompanied by a large folded copy of the map, deals with the work of the cartographer and its significance, while "The Earliest Jesuit Missionary Explorers in Florida, Maryland and Maine" follows these intrepid workers through their faithful but too often fatal labors.

A new sketch of Sir Walter Raleigh is by Sir Rennell Rodd. It appears in the English Men of Action series, published by Macmillan.

The Burrows Company have issued a reprint of John Eliot's *Logic Primer* of 1672. The *Primer* is an interlinear translation of the Indian text and the reprint is made from a photographic reproduction of the entire book (40 leaves) made in 1889 at the expense of the late James C. Pilling.

In *Great Britain and her American Colonies* (London, Finch, 1905), Mr. E. L. S. Horsburgh seeks to give in a readable and lucid way the principles which underlay the "unhappy contest" between the colonies and the mother-country. The volume is not unsuccessful, though it is not so much a presentation of principles as a simple narrative of the events of colonial history and the occurrences of the Revolutionary period.

A new edition of *The Life of Benjamin Franklin, written by himself*, which was originally edited by John Bigelow, is announced for early publication by the J. B. Lippincott Company.

A diary of twenty-eight pages, meager in historical material, but worthy of reprint because of its rarity and because it supplements or connects other accounts of prison life in Quebec in the intercolonial wars, is *A Narrative of the Captivity of Nehemiah How in 1745-1747*. It is reprinted from the original edition of 1748 and appears in the Burrows Brothers' series of Narratives of Captivities. The editing is well done.

The *Journals of the Continental Congress*, which were transferred from the Department of State to the Library of Congress, are just being published under the direction of Worthington C. Ford. It is expected that the entire work may comprise fourteen or fifteen volumes and that some five or six years may be necessary to complete the series. Only one volume is now published, in an edition of two thousand copies. One-half of the number will be offered to the public at the price of one dollar per volume. The copies will be placed on sale with the Superintendent



of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington. The Library has also issued, under the same direction, a *List of Vernon-Wager Manuscripts*, compiled by John C. Fitzpatrick. This collection once belonged to George Chalmers, passed to Peter Force, and then to the Library of Congress. It includes the correspondence of Admiral Sir Charles Wager and Vice-Admiral Edward Vernon, which throws light upon "the history of North America and upon British Colonial policy".

*The Winslow Papers, 1776-1826*, edited by W. O. Raymond and published under the auspices of the New Brunswick Historical Society, contain many letters to Judge Edward Winslow by noted loyalists, which are useful for the study of the attitude of the loyalists in the American Revolution.

*George Washington as an Engineer*, which was written by Henry Leffman and which appeared in the *Proceedings* of the Engineers' Club of Philadelphia, October, 1904, has been reprinted in a pamphlet of about twenty pages.

A well-edited volume of letters selected from the papers of Major-General William Heath has been issued by the Massachusetts Historical Society. These letters are of the direct military type. They contain much of historical worth, dealing with Heath's difficulties while in charge of the convention troops at Boston, and throw light on Sullivan's expedition to Rhode Island in conjunction with the fleet of D'Estaing, and on the failure of the Penobscot venture.

Houghton, Mifflin, and Company have brought out in a separate volume *The Evolution of the Constitution of the United States of America and History of the Monroe Doctrine*, which originally appeared as a part of two memorial volumes, *History of the Celebration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Promulgation of the Constitution of the United States*.

Among the volumes which have appeared very recently are to be noted: *The Civil Service and the Patronage*, by Carl Russell Fish, volume XI of the Harvard Historical Studies; *Cuba and the Intervention*, by Albert G. Robinson (New York, Longmans); *Our Navy and the Barbary Corsairs*, by Gardner W. Allen (Boston, Houghton).

An exceedingly valuable publication of the Library of Congress is entitled *Papers of James Monroe Listed in Chronological Order from the Original Manuscripts in the Library of Congress*. The list was prepared by Wilmer Ross Leech under the direction of Worthington Chauncey Ford and is intended to complement the alphabetical *Calendar of the Correspondence of James Monroe* issued as *Bulletin of Rolls and Library of the Department of State*, No. 2, November, 1893. An interesting feature of the publication is a reproduction in 12 pages, from the original manuscript, of Monroe's journal kept during the negotiations which led to the cession of Louisiana.

A lawyer by profession, Everett Pepperell Wheeler has essayed the congenial task of writing a volume on *Daniel Webster, the Expounder of the Constitution* (New York, Putnams). Nineteen chapters are de-

voted chiefly to those important cases and those momentous occasions in which the question of Constitutional interpretation was involved. The author in each instance gives an account of the circumstances which called forth the argumentative skill of Webster and then, by a free use of excerpts, makes clear the line of argument used. For instance, in telling of the Force Bill of 1833, the entire brief made by Webster is reprinted from the manuscript copy in possession of the New Hampshire Historical Society.

An interesting episode in American history is recalled by a monograph of which Joseph H. Benton, Jr., is the author. The volume, *A Notable Libel Case* (Boston, Charles E. Goodspeed, 1904, pp. 117), which is marked by a free quotation of documents and letters, refers to the criminal prosecution of Theodore Lyman, Jr., by Daniel Webster in the Supreme Court of Massachusetts in 1828. The case grew out of political animosity and was Webster's opportunity of replying to the charge, which caused the indictment of Lyman, that he had conspired with other Federalists to dissolve the Union in 1807-1808 and to reunite New and Old England.

In the February number of the *Atlantic Monthly* appears a valuable article on the Jackson and Van Buren papers in the Library of Congress, by James Schouler, a well-written description, showing briefly how an examination of these papers may affect our estimates of these men. The writer rightly points out the value of the Van Buren collection, which is evidently a selected lot of letters, but perhaps he does not quite rightly estimate the importance of the fact that the materials are selected, not unlikely chosen by Van Buren himself, and that the thoughtful statesman probably cast away papers less contributive to his own fame. Among other things Mr. Schouler discusses entertainingly the episode of the Rhea letter, with the conclusion that Jackson was responsible in the crisis of 1831 for the fabrication. Possibly the value of the great mass of Jackson papers is not rightly stated; for it seems probable that they will prove of immense significance; but as to this Mr. Schouler's judgment is naturally not to be ignored.

*The Narrative of the Adventures of Zenas Leonard* originally appeared in a Pennsylvania newspaper, and was later reprinted (1839). Leonard was lured by a love of adventure into the wild country of the west and northwest. He became a trapper, and the reprint of his journal of his experiences, 1831-1836, now published by Burrows Brothers, shows clearly the life of hardship and danger led by this hardy class of men, who knew the trails of the vast forests as a modern inhabitant of a city knows its streets. The journal tells a great deal about western Indian tribes, and also adds somewhat to our knowledge concerning the Walker expedition to California in 1833, which he joined. The volume is edited by Dr. W. F. Wagner.

Certain aspects of a large subject are briefly treated by Humphrey J. Desmond in a sketch entitled *The Know Nothing Party* (Washington, New Century Press, 1905, pp. 159).

Foreign interest in the Monroe doctrine is attested by two recent publications: *Die Annexion von Texas; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Monroe-Doktrin*, by Benajah H. Carroll (Berlin, Universitätsbuchdruckerei von G. Schade, 1904, pp. 63), and *L'Impérialisme Américain*, by Joseph Patouillet (Paris, A. Rousseau, 1904, pp. 388). The second chapter of the last volume is devoted to the Monroe doctrine.

The evolution of a school system is worked out in Daniel Putnam's *The Development of Primary and Secondary Education in Michigan* (Ann Arbor, Mich., George Wahr). The writer, a school man of many years' experience, traces in the first four chapters the effect of territorial laws, fundamental enactments of 1838 and 1850, and acts of the state legislature in working out a general educational plan. And then he considers topically and historically the divisions of the subject. Some of the topical headings are: common district schools, high-schools, courses of study, school support, text-books, and school supervision. Two other late publications along the same line as this volume of Dr. Putnam's are *Education in Indiana* (Indianapolis, William B. Burford), by Fassett A. Cotton, and *The New York Public School, Being a History of Free Education in the City of New York* (New York, Macmillan), by A. Emerson Palmer.

*John Brown, the Hero: Personal Reminiscences* (Boston, J. H. West Company, 1905, pp. 126) is by Dr. J. W. Winkley, a Boston man and a Free State colonist, who came under the spell of the Abolitionist leader during a short residence in Kansas. In the course of his appreciative account he describes two of the Kansas fights in which Brown participated.

An interesting pamphlet in connection with Civil War history is that written by Major Caleb Huse, formerly of the Confederate army. Major Huse was commissioned by President Davis to purchase military supplies in Europe for the Confederacy. His pamphlet entitled *The Supplies of the Confederate Army, How they were obtained in Europe and How paid for* (privately printed) deals with his four years' service abroad.

*Last Hours of Sheridan's Cavalry* (New York, privately printed, 1905, pp. 563) depicts the share taken by the cavalymen of the Army of the Potomac during the closing eleven days' campaign before Petersburg. General Tremain, the author, was an aide-de-camp on the staff of General Crook. He made notes on the events marking the close of hostilities soon after peace was made, and these notes are now, with the editorial supervision of General J. Watts de Peyster, given to the public.

Two recent volumes dealing with the career of Jefferson Davis are Landon Knight's *The Real Jefferson Davis* (Battle Creek, Mich., The Pilgrim Magazine Company) and Colonel John M. Craven's *Prison Life of Jefferson Davis* (New York, G. W. Dillingham Company). The former is a reprint of articles contributed to the *Pilgrim*, while Colonel Craven's work originally appeared in 1866.

Among late publications dealing with the history of individual regi-

ments during the period of the Civil War may be mentioned *Trials and Triumphs: the Record of the Fifty-fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry*, written by Hartwell Osborn and others, and published by McClurg; *The Story of the Twentieth Michigan Infantry, July 15th, 1862, to May 30th, 1865*, Byron M. Cutcheon, compiler (Lansing, Mich., 1904, pp. 271); *North Carolina Regimental Histories: a Complete History of the North Carolina Troops in the War of 1861-1865*, published in five volumes by N. O. Sherrill, State Librarian of North Carolina; and *The War Between the Union and the Confederacy and its Lost Opportunities, with a History of the Fifteenth Alabama Regiment, and the Forty-eight Battles in which it was Engaged* (New York, Neale Publishing Company). The last-named volume is in part given over to charges of mismanagement on the part of the political and military leaders of the South.

Cyrus Townsend Brady has given a serial title, *American Fights and Fighters*, to the four volumes which have so far appeared in the narratives of warfare, beginning with colonial times. The subtitle of the last volume issued, the fourth, is *Indian Fights and Fighters*, in which are described the sanguinary contests with the Sioux from the time of General Carrington's Powder river expedition to and including the annihilation of General Custer's command on the Little Big Horn in 1876. Much of Mr. Brady's material was obtained from surviving participants, both Indian and American, and his volume has both gained and suffered thereby. His conclusion that Custer's disobedience was the cause for the Little Big Horn massacre has led to wide-spread discussion. The series is published by McClure, Phillips, and Company.

Courses in civics and government in schools and colleges will find valuable helps in four manuals of recent issue. William H. Siebert's *The Government of Ohio* and Evarts Boutell Greene's *The Government of Illinois* are both published by the Macmillan Company with the Handbooks of American Government, and are works of distinct merit. The other volumes are for use in more elementary classes: Roscoe William Ashley's *Government and the Citizen* (New York, Macmillan) and Frank David Boynton's *School Civics* (Boston, Ginn).

Henry S. Burrage's *History of the Baptists in Maine* (Portland, Marks Printing House) covers the period from about 1675 to the present time. It treats freely the educational and temperance activities of the denomination, its connection with the anti-slavery agitation, its missionary labors, and the growth of its church organizations.

*The Diary of Matthew Patten of Bedford, N. H., from 1754 to 1788* has been published by the town (Concord, N. H., 1903, pp. 545). Patten was judge of probate, representative and councillor, and justice of the peace.

Hon. Redfield Proctor has found, in the Peter Force collection of manuscripts in the Library of Congress, several valuable documents relative to Vermont history, which have been published in facsimile under the title *Records of Conventions in the New Hampshire Grants*

for the Independence of Vermont, 1776-1777, with accompanying notes and comments (Washington, 1904).

A bibliography of the Massachusetts House Journals, 1715-1776, by Worthington C. Ford, is reprinted from the *Publications* of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts, volume IV.

The Bostonian Society presents, as a frontispiece to its *Proceedings* for 1904, a view of State street, Boston, about 1842, and includes, with the annual reports of officers, two historical papers: one by Walter Kendall Watkins on "Boston One Hundred Years Ago", and one by John Howland Crandon, "Colonial and Revolutionary Social Life".

*The History of Fairfield, Fairfield County, Conn., from 1700 to 1800* (New York, J. J. Little and Company), by Mrs. Elizabeth Hubbell Schenck, is a second volume. The first volume, covering the earlier period, was given to the press by Mrs. Schenck some nine years ago. The entire work contains much of historical worth, thrown in with a mass of extraneous matter. Another volume of local town history recently issued is the *First History of Bayonne, N. J.* (Bayonne, N. J., privately printed), by Whitcomb Royden Page.

*The History of Ancient Wethersfield, Connecticut* (New York, The Grafton Press), is in two ponderous volumes, edited by Henry M. Stiles from the manuscript of the late Judge Sherman W. Davis. The second volume is entirely genealogical, but in the first, which is really a series of brief historical monographs, occur chapters on such interesting topics as Wethersfield's share in the French and Indian War, Wethersfield's share in the American Revolution and maritime history.

A mingling of fiction and somewhat delusive fact gives the text of *Wadsworth, or the Charter Oak* (Hartford, Conn., privately printed, 1904, pp. 399), by W. H. Gocher, a doubtful historic value. The footnotes, the lavish illustrations, and the genealogical references may make the book worth while.

*Olde Ulster*, a historical and genealogical magazine, made its appearance in January under the editorship of Benjamin Myer Brink, Esq., whose labors in the field of historical research and Knickerbocker folklore in the state of New York have earned for him an enviable distinction. The aim of the magazine is to collect and preserve in permanent form the historical facts and incidents, as well as the genealogical records, relating to Ulster county, New York, as it existed in its earliest days. This territory—originally called The Esopus—covered an immense extent of country included in the present counties of Ulster, Orange, Greene, Delaware, and Sullivan. Its chief town is Kingston, the oldest settlement in the state north of New York city, Albany alone excepted. It was the scene of a horrible Indian massacre in 1663, became the first capital of the state in 1777, and was totally destroyed by fire the same year by the British under General Vaughan. Articles of considerable historical importance have already been printed in this magazine, among others a facsimile and translation from the Dutch of the earliest transfer of land in the Esopus county from the Indian

to the white man. This original document, only recently discovered, is a conveyance to Thomas Chambers, on the fifth of June, 1652, of a tract of land in the present city of Kingston, N. Y., which subsequently became a part of the manor of Fox Hall, of which this Thomas Chambers became the lord. The magazine is printed monthly, and is published in a dainty, old-fashioned style upon deckle-edge Moorish paper, in a form that at once appeals to the taste of the historical and literary connoisseur.

*Old Schenectady* (Schenectady, N. Y., Robson and Adey), by George S. Roberts, carries the reader back to 1682, when the Dutch Van Curlers, the Vedders, the Tellers, and other Dutch families settled there. The author does not attempt a historical narrative, but gives a series of pictures of the quaint town in the early days: its pioneer settlers; its defenses against Indian attack; its French and Indian massacre; its Dutch heirlooms. The value of the book is much enhanced by appropriate and well-executed cuts and half-tone illustrations.

In its *Year Book* of 1904, the Holland Society of New York prints the records of the Reformed Dutch Church at Albany from 1683 to 1700, and two "plots" of Albany in 1695 and in 1794.

*A Group of Great Lawyers of Columbia County, New York* (New York, privately printed, 1904, pp. viii, 264) is by a lawyer of Hudson, N. Y., Mr. Peyton F. Miller, who fills a volume with interesting reminiscences and gossip personal sketches of such men as Martin Van Buren, Samuel J. Tilden, Robert Livingston, Chancellor Robert R. Livingston, Edward Livingston, and others. It also contains a brief account of the Antirent war.

In addition to *A History of Columbia University* noted in the last number of the REVIEW, there has also appeared, in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of King's College, *Columbiana: a Bibliography of Manuscripts, Pamphlets and Books Relating to the History of King's College, Columbia College, Columbia University* (Columbia University, 1904, pp. 48). The work of preparation was done by Charles Alexander Nelson.

In the *University of Pennsylvania Medical Bulletin* for December, 1904, Dr. Charles W. Dulles finds that the foundation of that institution was made in 1740 instead of 1749, the usually accepted date. He bases his contention on the fact that when Benjamin Franklin and other leading men came to establish the academy, which grew into the university, they took over the plant and the aims of a charity school, which had begun its existence in 1740, under the spell of Whitefield's eloquence. The paper is reprinted in a pamphlet of twenty-nine pages, entitled *The Charity School of 1740*.

"Congress Voting Independence" is the title given to an article in the January number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine*, which attributes this famous painting to Robert Edge Pine and Edward Savage. "Excerpts from the Papers of Dr. Benjamin Rush" show his dissatisfaction with the governing powers during the progress of the Revolutionary



War. A few *bons mots* of Franklin are included. Other documentary material is given in "Some Revolutionary Correspondence of Dr. James McHenry", and several pages are devoted to "David Edwin, Engraver".

The *Report of the State Librarian of Pennsylvania*, 1903, recently published, contains a chronological list of provincial assemblies and state legislatures, and a valuable "check list of laws, minutes, journals, and documents of the state of Pennsylvania, 1682-1901".

A quaint Quaker love story is that of *Hannah Logan's Courtship* (Philadelphia, Ferris and Leach), which is told in a diary by the man who wooed and won her. John Smith, a Philadelphia merchant and assemblyman of Pennsylvania and a King's Councillor of New Jersey, met his "charmer" at the home of her father, James Logan, colonial governor of Pennsylvania, in 1744. His suit was marked by vicissitudes, but ultimately the marriage was solemnized "in an awful and intelligible manner". There is little in the volume on public affairs, but the genealogical notes of the editor, Albert Cook Myers, and the illustrations of the Stenton home and of Pennsylvania personages are of distinct interest.

Of the reprinting of early pamphlets bearing on American history there seems just now to be no end; and the historical scholar has no anxiety to see the flood cease. Among the recent reprints published by the Burrows Brothers, Cleveland, is a very attractive edition of Thomas Hutchins's *A Topographical Description of Virginia, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and North Carolina*, from the original edition of 1778, edited by Frederick Charles Hicks, who has written a biography much more elaborate than the biographical sketches usually accompanying such reprints, and has supplied a careful and extensive bibliography of the writings of Hutchins. Several maps are inserted in the text, and a pocket holds a large folded copy of Hutchins's map of 1778. The biography of the "Geographer to the United States" was of itself well worth writing, and Mr. Hicks has taken his task seriously, using good source-material and collecting his information with commendable care.

*Descriptions of Maryland*, by Bernard C. Steiner, is a new volume in the Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science. This is a chronological bibliography, preceded by brief notes regarding the travelers who published their descriptions. *The Early Period of Reconstruction in South Carolina*, by John Porter Hollis, in the same series, has introductory pages on the condition of the state after the Civil War, followed by a study of the effects of plans of reconstruction.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* continues the publication of important papers under the headings: "Proceedings of the Virginia Committee of Correspondence, 1759-'70"; "Vestry Book of King William Parish, Va., 1707-1750"; "Virginia Militia in the Revolution"; and "Moravian Diaries of Travels through Virginia". There are several Jefferson letters in the number.



In the *William and Mary College Quarterly* for January there is a continuation of the very interesting "Journal of the Meetings of the Presidents and Masters or Professors of William and Mary College".

*Virginia County Records, Spotsylvania County, 1721-1800*, volume I (New York, Fox, Duffield, and Company, 1905) marks the beginning of a very important undertaking. For this volume, W. Clayton Torrence, of Fredericksburg, made "transcriptions from the Original Files at the County Court House of Wills, Deeds, Administration and Guardian Bonds, Marriage Licenses, Lists of Revolutionary Pensions". Other resident genealogists are to do the same work for succeeding volumes. The work so far seems to be done with great accuracy, the index is excellent, and the form in which the matter appears is neat and attractive. The general editor for the series is W. Armstrong Crozier.

The chief material in the January number of the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* is documentary. "Correspondence between Hon. Henry Laurens and his Son, John, 1777-1780" is a series of letters on Revolutionary matters; "Records of the Regiments of the South Carolina Line, Continental Establishment" is a continuation from the previous issue of the magazine.

The first two volumes of *The Colonial Records of Georgia*, which have quite recently been issued under the authority of the state legislature, suggest that a valuable piece of historical work is being done. We have in these early volumes a reprint of the colonial charter, and the documents showing the course of administration from 1732 to 1752. Among these papers are the laws and by-laws adopted by the trustees, along with the journal of their proceedings and minutes of the Common Council. Later volumes promise to contain documentary material of even greater value. The private journal of Lord Percival and the diary of Colonel William Stephens, proceedings of legislative and executive bodies down to and through the Revolutionary War, the account of the first Constitutional Convention, and the lists of proscribed royalists and rebels are to be reprinted. There is so far no annotation. Allen D. Candler is the compiler and editor of the volumes.

*Illinois Railway Legislation and Commission Control since 1870* is a monograph by J. H. Gordon (published by the University of Illinois). An introduction by Professor M. B. Hammond deals with the attempts of the state of Illinois to control railway rates before 1870.

Houghton, Mifflin, and Company have published a revised edition of *Indiana* in the American Commonwealths series. The author, J. P. Dunn, Jr., has increased its value in the revision by adding a chapter of about fifty pages on the history of the state since its admission to the Union. Otherwise, the changes made are slight.

There are three Civil War articles in the January number of the *Annals of Iowa*. The titles of the articles are: "Fort Dodge Soldiers in the East"; "The Battle of Athens, Missouri"; and "Voting with the Soldiers in 1864". Other articles of local interest appear.

The *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* contains an article, "The

Genesis of Popular Sovereignty", by Allen Johnson of Iowa College, which, claiming the authorship of the doctrine for Stephen A. Douglas, attempts to prove by illustrations that the tap-root of popular sovereignty "was the instinctive attachment of the Western American to local government".

Small, Maynard, and Company announce the publication of *A Report on Colonial Administration in the Far East*, by Alleyne Ireland. There are to be ten volumes, or possibly twelve in all, the first to appear soon and the others to be issued successively at intervals of about four months. The edition is limited. The volumes will contain much original material as well as description and comment. The Philippines will naturally receive full attention.

The sixth volume in the Makers of Canada series (Toronto, Morang and Company) is by Lady Edgar on *General Brock*. Another volume on *Champlain*, by Narcisse E. Dionne, is in press. The entire series is to be completed in twenty volumes.

The January *Acadiensis* gives, under the title "The Proces-Verbal of Andrew Certain", a translation of a document in the French archives, an account of the circumstances attending the taking of Fort Latour or Fort St. John by the Sieur d'Aunay in 1645. The number also contains the early chapters of *The Judges of New Brunswick and Their Times*, "from the manuscript of the late Joseph Wilson Lawrence".

There is a continuation of the Cheverus letters in the December *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society*, and extracts from the journal of Bishop Plessis of Quebec, who in 1815 visited eastern Canada, the maritime provinces, and the chief eastern cities of the United States.

Rev. A. G. Morice has contributed to our knowledge of the northwest in *The History of the Northern Interior of British Columbia* (Toronto, William Briggs, 1904, pp. xi, 349). The author describes the pre-European conditions, Alexander Mackenzie's land voyage to the Pacific in 1792-1793, the first trading-posts established by Simon Fraser, William Harmon, and others before the operations of the Hudson's Bay Company. The volume is carried down to 1880.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Captain A. T. Mahan, *The War of 1812*, II, "The Campaign of 1814" (Scribner's Magazine, January); Amasi M. Eaton, *The Development of the Judicial System in Rhode Island* (Yale Law Journal, January); Francis C. Lowell, *George Frisbie Hoar* (Harvard Graduates' Magazine, March); William Wirt Howe, *Law in the Louisiana Purchase* (Yale Law Journal, February); Judge E. P. Gates, *The Lawyers of the Revolution* (American Law Review, January-February); F. C. Wade, *The Surrender of Sitting Bull* (Canadian Magazine, February); Adrian H. Joline, *Martin Van Buren, the Lawyer* (Green Bag, March); Gaillard Hunt, *The First Inauguration Ball* (Century Magazine, March); A. G. Bradley, *The Fight for North America* (concluded in Canadian Magazine, January); A. F. Bandélier, *The Truth about Inca Civilization* (Harper's Magazine, March); Sena-

tor S. M. Cullum, *The Treaty-Making Power* (North American Review, March); *Old Fort Massac* (American Monthly Magazine, March); Frederick Austin Ogg, *The Growth of Population in the Mississippi Valley* (World of To-Day, February); Agnes C. Laut, *The Discoverer of Alaska* (Leslie's Monthly, March); Docteur Magnac, *L'Expédition du Général Leclerc à Saint-Domingue* (running in Le Carnet); Pascual Santacruz, *Clínicas de la Historia* (La España Moderna, February).